

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 104, NO. 23

NEW YORK, MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1941

NUMBER 1384

The Lesson of Crete

From London come reports that the British people are shocked and dismayed by the fall of Crete. If they are, chalk up another bad blunder for the British censorship for failing to prepare their minds for a disaster that has been possible for months. By now the dullest person ought to know that the British have available at the very most in the entire Mediterranean area only a few hundred thousand men and very limited equipment. Germany on the other hand has several million troops many of whom have never yet been put into the front lines. She can transport vast masses of equipment by rail to Greece and thence she can send men and supplies to any nearby point by air, by sea, and by land through Turkey or even Russia. Her achievement in winning control of Crete almost entirely by air was a brilliant one; but it would have been more brilliant if she had not ultimately outnumbered the British in every way by at least ten to one.

In the light of this fact, no false hopes should be built upon the British victory in Irak. Rashid Ali made a fatal error in timing by not waiting until the Germans got there. But get there they eventually will, unless a miracle intervenes. The British are a nation of only about half as many people as the Germans; they feel they must keep most of their troops and aerial equipment at home to prevent successful invasion. The only real purpose of the Mediterranean campaign from the British point of view must be to distract the attention of the Germans and to slow them down as much as

possible, hoping thereby to gain time to perfect their defenses and to let America's mobilized industry get under way. The British would certainly do well to give up all hope of compromising with the Vichy set of Nazi stooges and seize Syria at once; but even if they do so, the chance of a successful termination of the Mediterranean campaign is still slim. Any candid military expert must say that unless the United States should within the next few weeks throw its full weight into the war, the British may have to evacuate Palestine and Egypt. This of course does not mean the end of the war. A fighting front in Africa would probably still exist in the west, and as long as the British Isles themselves hold out there is always a chance of final success; and with American aid it becomes a good chance.

Take the Initiative!

The British are right, however, to be restive. The sharp criticism uttered on June 3 by The Daily Mail is justified not chiefly in military terms but in political and industrial ones. There is still far too much "business as usual" in England—and a great deal more in America. The British government clearly needs new blood. The New Statesman in a recent issue demanded to know why the British even now seem unable to take the initiative anywhere in the world. Why is it, the paper said in effect, that Hitler always chooses the time and place to fight? When the Germans attacked Norway, why didn't Britain invade Italy; when Hitler moved to the Balkans, sound strategy would have told Britain to occupy Spanish Morocco; and even before

CONTENTS

The Week 775

Editorials

Our Lagging Defense 778
British Peace Terms 779
Tokyo as Munich 780
A Bad Farm Bill 781

General Articles

The Lesson of the Bismarck
. William Harlan Hale 782
Georgia Bottleneck Willson Whitman 784
Nutrition for National Defense
. Thomas Parran, M.D. 786
Conscientious Objectors in Britain
. H. N. Brailsford 789

Hitler's American Dream Max Lerner 790
Man in the Mirror (verse) Legarde S. Doughty 791
Washington Notes T. R. B. 792
Not So Good Otis Ferguson 793
A Communication Sir Norman Angell 794
The Bandwagon 795

Correspondence 796

Marginalia Malcolm Cowley 798

Books in Review

The War and the Poets Joseph Freeman 799
Gabfest Nigel Dennis 800
Tearful Standard Edgar Johnson 800
Freedom and Its Enemies M. R. Werner 801
Crimes of a Month Mort. Post 802

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1941, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

that they should have seized Sicily. Whether these illustrations are sound, we do not know; but we are certain that the principle behind them is a good one. Hitler will never be overcome by following him around, waiting until he has done something, and then trying to undo it.

Hughes, Judicial Statesman

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, now voluntarily retired, will probably be remembered not as a great jurist in the technical sense, but rather as a great judicial statesman. One can find apparent inconsistencies in his legal reasoning from one decision to another. There are those who will say that he showed a development from a rigid conservatism to an acceptance of progressive doctrine, and that in this respect he mellowed as he grew older, like a cask of good wine. But to us the changes seem too discontinuous to be a result of mere aging in a cool cellar of isolation.

On questions involving social issues it was almost always more difficult to predict where Hughes would stand than where the other members of the Court would be found. The most dramatic shift came immediately after the fight about the court bill. The Chief Justice could hardly have been governed by prudential considerations concerning himself or his prestige; he had already reached a secure apex. But he may well have been concerned about the prestige of the Court and its influence on the life of the nation, as well as about the political stability of the nation itself. It often looked as if he were considering issues, not as a devotee of some unchangeable absolute known as "The Law," but as a sort of moderator among vested interests and social forces. And it is possible to argue that he finally became convinced that a majority of the people was determined to change some of our institutions, and that the Court would only injure itself and foment a dangerous split if it continued to obstruct the popular will. In so doing the Chief Justice may have spared the country more danger than is easily imagined.

The Pope Says Yes and No

Herbert L. Matthews, The New York Times's Rome correspondent, summed up the Pope's last address with his usual common sense. "Both sides," he writes, will be out "to show that the Pontiff was anti-Fascist or pro-Fascist," but a study of the address indicates "that the balance has been pretty finely kept." The Pope declares himself in favor of "vital spaces" for overpopulated countries—but not at the expense of war. He supports the continuance of private property—while recognizing the function of the state as a "control" over it. He calls for independence for labor—but supports state action when employers and workers "do not fulfil their functions." Individual freedom must definitely be retained—but there is a "wide field" in which the authority of the state must be recognized

in forestalling economic imbalance "arising from plurality and divergence of clashing interests."

This could be the acceptable address of a cautious liberal politician at any time but the present. Coming when the world is divided by war, it can only leave behind it a sense of dissatisfaction, of resentment at its effort to chide both the democracies and the Fascist countries with exactly equal emphasis. Democracy, as it exists in America and England today, can do with frank criticism of its shortcomings; it may still remedy them. But does the Pope really believe that the Fascist state can confine itself to an honorable balance between individual freedom and state authority?

A Better Way with Japan

For the reasons discussed in our editorial on page 780, it would be folly to try to appease Japan. But there is another course which may be added to a firm refusal to grant anything to Japanese aggression—a course of the nature suggested months ago in The New Republic, and now brought to mind by Secretary Hull's letter to Dr. Quo expressing an intention to give up extraterritorial rights in China after the war. This course would be calculated to show Japanese moderates that there is a way out for them which would promote Japanese prosperity and save face, other than the way of conquest and domination. It would be a treaty among Britain, this country and China binding the Western powers not only to give up all special privileges but to help China with a plan of national development and investment, once her status as an independent nation were assured. This treaty would explicitly leave the door open to any other nation which cared to join it, thus giving Japan an opportunity, once she withdrew her armed forces, to be an equal partner in the immense future development of the Asiatic mainland.

Appeasement is extending concessions to those who will merely exploit them for aggression. But there is good reason to offer the Japanese—like the Germans—a better alternative than force. If Nippon's admirals and generals persisted in an attempt to conquer the Far East while we were busy in the Atlantic, and, as is not by any means certain, got away with it, they would have to withdraw after an Allied victory. With this prospect continually before them, the Japanese might come to prefer a more sensible and coöperative course.

No Gas on Sunday?

Gasless Sundays, proposed by Secretary Ickes as a means of solving the problem created by the shortage of tankers and tank cars, are no longer the simple matter they were in 1918. In those days, they meant that people took streetcars to church and went walking instead of driving on Sunday afternoons. Hundreds of thousands of American families now own or rent summer cottages and spend their Sundays in the country,

often a half-hour's drive from the nearest railway station. Week-ends are an industry in which the middle classes have invested their savings. Whole townships within 150 miles of the metropolitan centers have come to base their economy on week-end residents. Farmers sell their produce in roadside markets, doing their biggest business on Sundays. The week-enders themselves have profited greatly in health. And gasless Sundays would largely disrupt the whole system.

The country must and will do whatever is necessary to defeat Hitler. If gasless Sundays are part of the price, it will be paid. Common sense would suggest, however, that the first step should be the rationing of gasoline throughout the entire week. Recent careful studies have shown that a surprisingly large proportion of Sunday traffic has sound business reasons behind it. On the other hand a huge proportion of the weekday use of passenger vehicles comes under the head of dispensable pleasure driving. Rationing would solve both problems with a minimum of dislocation.

Bad News from the Newspaper Guild

If the members of a particular unit in a labor union believe that a course of action on which the union has embarked is a mistaken one, have they the right to pass a resolution and forward it to the union's executive committee and the union's own newspaper or bulletin? Since not only the principle of freedom of speech but the practical working of democratic government plainly depends on an awareness by such dissenters of their downright obligation to take such action, the question may seem absurd. But eleven members of the New York chapter of the Newspaper Guild are at the moment on trial and facing possible expulsion for having done so. They work for Justice, the organ of the ILGWU. Their resolution was a protest against the Guild's decision to ratify a strike against The Jewish Day. Whether that strike is right or wrong is not the point. What is important and very bad news indeed is that the Guild should so flagrantly embrace the Communist and Nazi doctrine of intolerant "party discipline." The decision to bring these eleven men to a formal trial was made at a meeting attended by 335 Guildsmen out of a total New York City membership of 4,200. The vote was 261 to 74. What do the other 3,800 or so union newspapermen think of this? For the sake of the future welfare of the Guild we hope more resolutions will be passed and forwarded.

Saving Daylight and Saving Power

Secretary of the Interior Ickes' proposal for nationwide daylight saving to conserve our rapidly dwindling supply of electric energy has merit—but not enough. We doubt that it will make up for the shortages now becoming apparent. Moreover, it has dangerous possibilities. It might be utilized by private-utility interests—by both the industry's spokesman, the Edison Elec-

tric Institute and its friends within the OPM—as an excuse for not expanding our generating capacity, particularly by the further development of public-power projects such as the St. Lawrence, which is soon to come up in Congress.

The facts about daylight saving, briefly, are these. About 70 percent of our available electric power is used by industry. Daylight saving will not lower this percentage of the total consumption, since little of it is used for lighting. The remaining 30 percent of electric power is divided among household, commercial and rural users. It is estimated that a little more than half of this is used directly for lighting purposes. Thus, daylight saving, assuming that it prevents a full hour of electric consumption a day, will result in only a fractional husbanding of the total—far less than is needed, we are informed, to bridge the gap between the power we could use and the power we have.

We are certain that so stalwart an exponent of sound power policy as Secretary Ickes did not intend his daylight-saving scheme as a substitute for the development of new power sources. A word of reassurance from those in Washington responsible for the supply of power for defense industry would be in order.

Shall We Freeze Next Winter?

If consumers next winter can't buy tires for their automobiles or fuel oil for their furnaces, they will be told to blame the war for their immobilization and their shivers. There is no doubt, according to recent reports from Washington, that such shortages are in prospect. But the consumers will be misinformed. Both scarcities will be due to inadequate water transportation, and that in turn may be laid squarely at the door of the Maritime Commission. Through thick and thin it has stuck to the practice of ordering ships custom-made by favored shipyards, without resorting to the pre-fabrication which we learned in the last war, and which can turn out whole armadas of merchant vessels. If consumers don't want to freeze, it is up to them to stand on their hind legs and shout at Admiral Land, "Why don't you turn out the ships?"

Canadian Labor Wants a New Deal

Canada needs a Wagner Act. There were forty-six more strikes in Canada in 1940 than in 1939, and more in March and April, 1941, than in those months last year. Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, warns that the number will inevitably increase unless fair conditions are enforced in war industries. Strikes are illegal in Canada prior to an investigation of a dispute by a board of conciliation. But unions point out that two to five months can elapse before the board reports—a "cooling-off period" which merely fans grievances. Canada has an act which makes it a criminal offense for employers to use intimidation to prevent their employees from joining unions. But it

has been impossible to obtain a single conviction against employers who violate it. There is no enabling legislation, similar to that provided by the Wagner Act in the United States, to bring them to book.

Wages have been stabilized at the 1926-29 level; a bonus is supposed to be paid in localities where the cost of living has risen by more than five percent since August, 1939. Labor feels unfairly held down to a living standard that was too low fifteen years ago, and says that the bonus system does not meet present living costs. At the beginning of the war, Canadian labor pledged full support to the government's war effort. But it has been excluded from responsibility for the management of that effort, except through representation on the National Labor Supply Council, a purely advisory body. Result: the work falters. There is a lesson here for us that deserves headlines.

News Notes of a Week

Ambassador Winant returned from London unexpectedly to report to FDR. . . . A \$25,000,000 fire laid waste six blocks of Jersey City waterfront. State and federal authorities said, "No sabotage." . . . Dr. Kurt Heinrich Reith, described by the Department of Justice as "the number one Nazi in the United States," was arrested by immigration officers in his rooms at the Waldorf-Astoria. . . . Charles Lindbergh repeated that odd and unappetizing demand for "a new leadership." It does not quite make sense to Americans who know that they elected a President seven months ago, to serve for four years. . . . Some light was let into one of the dark corners of the country when an Oglethorpe County, Georgia, plantation owner, William Toliver Cunningham, and his lawyer, Hamilton McWhorter, were indicted in Chicago for conspiracy to hold Negroes in a state of peonage. . . . The SS America has been requisitioned by the navy. . . . Secretary Ickes was made coördinator of the petroleum industry. . . . Dr. Frank Kingdon, chairman of the Emergency Rescue Committee, denied that important numbers of Gestapo agents were entering the country as refugees, as Jan Valtin had suggested. . . . The President asked Congress for authority to requisition, with compensation, any private property in the interest of defense. . . . Everyone was saddened by the death of Lou Gehrig.

The Germans bombed Dublin again. Mr. de Valera protested, and demanded reparations and "assurances." Eire is confident that her policy of neutrality is realistic. . . . Weygand took a plane to Vichy to confer with Pétain. Hitler and Mussolini had another Brenner Pass meeting. Subject matter of both conferences—what to do when the United States comes in? . . . The first food ship sent under the lease-lend act landed eggs, cheese and flour at a British port. . . . British troops were reported ready to enter Syria. Ankara said German motorized infantry had been landed in Syria by plane. . . . Hugh Walpole died in England.

Our Lagging Defense

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL-DEFENSE EFFORT is now just about a year old. It started in earnest only after we came to realize that France was about to collapse and that the threat of world domination by Hitler was no idle phrase of Nazi oratory. What have we done in that year?

On the whole, our record can only be described as bitterly disappointing. Certainly, much has been accomplished. Many men have worked hard during these twelve months, and they deserve the thanks of their fellow countrymen. Measured by any ordinary yardstick, what has been turned out in this year has been impressive. But we cannot afford to apply ordinary yardsticks. Unless our effort is strong enough to make certain that in the end Britain and America together will defeat Hitler, we might as well make no effort at all. This is the standard by which our activities must be measured. By this standard, what we have done is shockingly inadequate.

The simplest way to measure results is in the proportion of total national resources spent. Hitler for some years has devoted to war purposes more than half the German national income. No one knows what contribution he forces from the conquered countries, but it must be very large. As recently as February of this year he was getting from France alone more goods of all kinds than England was getting from us, and the increase in our shipments since then has been painfully small, even without taking into account the proportion which Hitler's submarines and raiders have sent to the bottom en route.

At the present moment we are spending for war purposes between one-seventh and one-eighth of our national income. The bravest plans that are in sight in Washington call for an increase, by a year from this July, to one-sixth of our national income.

In other words, we are still playing at national defense. We all talk about the necessity for sacrifice, but nobody is willing to accept any for himself. Our effort ought to be made at least four times greater than it is at present, and three times greater than it will be one year from now, if we really are in earnest about stopping Hitler. And these figures are a minimum. We are trying to do in two or three years what Germany did in seven. The German people within a few months after Hitler came to power were sacrificing for the national armament program on a scale far greater than Americans have yet put into effect—a scale which would bring roars of protest if it were installed here tomorrow. Yet obviously to catch up with Hitler we should be doing far more than Germany every day instead of, as at present, only about one-third as much, including production for our own defenses as well as material for Britain.

The story of what is wrong with our national-defense effort is a familiar one. You are tired of it and so are we; but the discussion must continue until the evils are remedied. One of these evils is the lack of authority except on the desk of the President, who is trying to carry out four or five jobs any one of which is too big for a single individual. Another is the refusal of business men either to expand plants themselves or permit the government to expand, beyond what they estimate to be the potential peacetime consumption after the war emergency is over. It is bad enough when they demand that surplus quantities be found by cutting off production for private use for the period of an emergency; but it is far worse when their selfishness results in an absolute shortage of materials even with private consumption cut to a minimum or stopped entirely. When *The New Republic* said last February that we were running into an ugly shortage of aluminum, spokesmen for the monopolistic Aluminum Company of America laughed at us. Today government agents are going from door to door in certain states begging old saucepans from housewives. It is possible that the Aluminum Company of America may have managed singlehanded to bring America to the verge of destruction; yet the officers who were guilty of this nightmare blunder in their eagerness to hog all possible profits for their company still sit blandly in the places of power. And what is true of aluminum is true, almost letter for letter, of steel and other materials.

The rest of the story is in the same pattern. Subcontracting is only just beginning; if it were pursued to the full we could probably double our industrial output as of today. Hardly any plants are yet working three shifts outside the airplane industry. There has been no real reduction in automobile output for private use because even the 20-percent cut, when it goes into effect, only brings us back to the high level of a year ago.

It is increasingly clear that the dollar-a-year men who flocked to Washington last June and July are in most cases without bold imagination and the willingness to deal drastically with their fellow industrialists. It is equally clear that many important officers in the army and navy are not fitted by training, experience or personality for jobs of the size that now confront them. On the whole, and in terms of the present emergency, we are doing even worse than we did in 1917 and for reasons which were clear then and should have been equally clear at any time in these past twelve months. A certain lack of efficiency may well be inevitable in a democracy as compared with a dictatorship where the Leader has only to command; but the inefficiency of these past months in Washington goes far beyond those reasonable limits into the realm of inexcusable bungling. It must be stopped if we are to survive the attack that we may soon expect, the attack which has already in fact begun.

British Peace Terms

AFTER the sensational events of the war during the past ten days have faded into the record, it may become recognized that the most significant news of the period was the speech on post-war reconstruction by Anthony Eden. He is the first responsible British statesman to discuss the subject in any detail. The importance of the speech is not attributable to Mr. Eden personally, for though he shone by comparison with Mr. Chamberlain, he has never evinced a bold imagination or a strong leadership. But in this speech he was acting as the mouthpiece for a point of view which has been the subject of much careful thought in both Britain and the United States, an approach to the subject which has often been expressed in *The New Republic*. That a responsible official of the British government should endorse it is of great moment to us all.

This point of view is as noteworthy for what it omits as for what it includes. At this stage of the last war, Allied statesmen were talking of redrawing international boundaries, of self-determination of small nations, of punishment and reparations. The atmosphere of the discussion was political and nationalist. Little of this sort can be found in Mr. Eden's speech. He rather chose for his major emphasis "freedom from want"—the third of President Roosevelt's four freedoms. Social security, he said, was the main post-war objective of Britain, for herself and for the whole world. And in seeking it he assumed the existence not of a congeries of separated nations, but in Europe, at any rate, of a far-reaching international economic order.

Briefly he sketched the immediate prostration of Europe after the hostilities—in a setting of physical devastation, industry and agriculture would be prostrate because no country would have a surplus to exchange with others. On such a distraught economy would be laid the added burden of demobilization. To meet this situation two major measures were recommended by Mr. Eden—a common pool of resources so that needed products might be rationally distributed, and relief to be derived from the great surplus stocks accumulated in the Western Hemisphere during the war. Britain, the dominions and the United States could offer this relief, he said, while Germany certainly could not.

After the emergency was met, he pictured, though more vaguely, a constructive international economy aimed at avoiding the fluctuations of trade, employment and currency which marked the post-war decade. He was emphatic in rejecting a return to the old chaos—though after the last war the chief idea was to re-instate the economy which had existed before hostilities began.

"We have learned a lesson in the interregnum between two wars," said Mr. Eden. "We know that no escape can be found from the curse which has been lying on Europe except by creating and preserving economic health in every country." And what is necessary for economic health? "An international economic system capable of translating the technical possibilities of production into actual plenty and maintaining the whole population in industrious fruitful activity." In other words, an economy of plenty, with full employment, is the insurance against future war. That is what progressives have been saying both in Britain and this country for a long time.

Mr. Eden's attitude toward Germany was not vindictive. Under the new system she must, of course, play a part. But he saw that no such system could be erected so long as Germany had power to disturb the peace. "She must never be in a position to play that role again." This implies, undoubtedly, absorbing Germany into a larger whole which, while it would maintain a high standard of living for Germans as for others, would not tolerate either an aggressive German government or German means of manufacturing the weapons needed for a modern army. In place of the doctrine of the master race, Mr. Eden offers the prospect of worldwide economic coöperation. Many Germans, we may hope, will eventually be glad to make the exchange.

Tokyo as Munich

THE WINDS OF APPEASEMENT are blowing heavily now from Washington to Tokyo. For three weeks there have been persistent press reports that some sort of agreement between the State Department and the Japanese Foreign Office was on foot. Recent straws in the wind, including the failure of the President to mention Japan in his speech, have caused many to wonder whether America may not be contemplating a Far Eastern Munich.

If this should be the case, it would be disastrous. The record is fairly clear on two scores: first, that we have tended to appease Japan, and second, that Japan is unappeasable. We are still shipping her essential war materials. From 1937 to 1940 we sent her over a billion dollars' worth of supplies. In 1940 alone the amount was almost a quarter of a billion, of which 64 percent was in essential war materials, including oil, scrap iron, steel, copper and machine tools. In the first three months of this year, despite an appreciable slowing up of exports in general, oil for the war lamps of Tokyo still continued to flow. Some of the oil companies report that they are selling oil not only with State Department permission but even with its encouragement. And copper, not under the licensing system yet, flows faster than ever.

So where are we? In the position of sending China loans and credits and good wishes, and missions, and even some airplanes, and letters like the one just published from Mr. Hull to Dr. Quo saying that America is ready to step out of China after the war; and at the same time furnishing Japan with the means for crushing China.

What sense does it make? There seem to be three grounds for appeasement of Japan. One is that America is in no position to fight a two-ocean war, and therefore in no position to resist Japanese attempts at expansion toward French Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies and the Philippines. The second is that a victorious China might strengthen the Soviet Union or itself be subject to a communist revolution. The third is that the forces inside Japan are themselves split on the question of further aggression, and that a conciliatory policy on our part would strengthen the moderates.

These are exactly the arguments that have been used by appeasers in Europe for a decade. There is always the argument of military weakness. There is always the argument of the communist alternative. There is always the argument of helping the moderates in the aggressor's ranks. For American naval weakness substitute British air weakness; for a communist China substitute a communist Spain or Czechoslovakia; for Premier Konoye substitute Herr Goering; and you have the Munich settlement. A map of the appeaser's mind is not complete unless it has three arguments on it as the three fixed points from which all else is measured.

But appeasement has not worked elsewhere, and there is no reason to believe that it will work here. Why should we believe that the Japanese mean to make more concessions to us than they have to? Matsuoka's statement last week that Japan is still allied with the Axis gives us clearly enough Japan's general direction. The statement some time ago of the post-war world that Japan envisages gives even greater definiteness to the picture.

The core of American policy in the Far East must be a strong and democratic China, free of foreign domination and intervention. It is not enough to have sympathy for China, any more than it is enough to have sympathy for Britain. We must back that sympathy up with deeds, and the clearest deed would be to stop the shipment of oil and copper to Japan, and increase economic aid to China. For in military terms the Chinese are in a good position: their great problems today are economic. But with American aid for their coöperatives, they should solve economic problems too.

If it be argued that Japan will fight if we cut off our oil supplies, we answer that if the Japanese feel they are strong enough to take us on in addition to China they will do it anyway, appeasement or not. And if

the Japanese refrain from taking the Dutch East Indies it will be because they fear to extend their military and naval lines that far, rather than because we are giving them oil. There is no reason why we should assume an unnecessarily provocative attitude toward Japan; but, equally, there is no reason why we should not go along calmly making the basis of our policy not the question of whether we will fight for the Dutch East Indies, but the question of whether we will allow China to go down.

There are two important reasons why we must help China now more than ever. One is that a strong China will be our most effective insurance against Japanese domination of the Far East, and the consequent destruction of our post-war markets and the strengthening of Hitler's "new world order." The second runs not in terms of power politics but in terms of ideological weapons. If we abandon China we abandon one of the great democratic efforts of resistance to fascism in the world today. How can we do that and still continue to talk and think of America as the spearhead of democratic advance? To appease Japan is to betray the deepest meaning of democratic defense.

A Bad Farm Bill

ED O'NEAL, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, is at it again. He and his farm lobby are now out to obtain passage of the Gore Amendment to the pending bill for expansion of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If adopted, this measure means death for some of the most progressive phases of our agricultural policy. Passage of the Gore Amendment, according to farm experts, means changes in or the end of the Food Stamp Plan and surplus-food purchases for relief, and the immobilization of the ever normal granary.

Appearing before the Banking and Credit Committee of the House on May 30, O'Neal demanded in the name of the Farm Bureau that Congress forbid the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy or sell farm products for less than parity prices, warning that otherwise the nation's farmers are "headed for grave disaster."

What he really meant was that Milo Perkins and the Surplus Marketing Administration offer a continuing threat to his philosophy of scarcity-economics and he is out to put them out of business. A forthright declaration of war on the Food Stamp Plan and its corollaries would have got O'Neal nowhere at all, for this plan, solely on its merits, has become perhaps the most popular part of the New Deal farm program. But under the guise of protecting farm prices, O'Neal appears dangerously close to putting through a measure that will raise retail food prices still higher and at the same time will not achieve its stated objective of materially raising farm income.

In demanding passage of the Gore Amendment at the congressional hearings, O'Neal neglected to say that fully 75 percent of total agricultural income is from non-basic crops and that the system of parity payments operates in an entirely different manner for these crops than for such non-perishables as corn and cotton.

Price-pegging loans which will support farm income for the five basic crops cannot have the same effect for most of the non-basic, perishable crops. Fruits and vegetables in most cases must be used; they cannot be locked in storage without spoilage and must be moved into consumption. In other words, higher farm income, which is the aim professed by Mr. O'Neal, can be achieved by a higher loan rate on commodities which can be stored for relatively long periods of time, but to get the same effect on perishable and semi-perishable crops, greater purchase funds must be available to move these crops into consumption rather than into the ever-normal-granary "tin cans" that dot the Middle Western landscape.

Nor did Mr. O'Neal tell the Congress how rich food processors are likely to grow if this new mandatory legislation is passed. A great many processed farm products, such as meats, canned tomatoes, flour, cheese, dried eggs and evaporated milk, are now being bought by the Department of Agriculture largely for Britain. If these purchases were made at parity, when processors are not paying parity prices to farmers, the taxpayers' money would be thrown away in paying unwarranted prices to certain business groups. Flour bought at 100 percent of parity, for example, certainly would be absurd in the face of an 85-percent wheat loan.

The Washington farm lobby executed its latest move even while the National Nutrition Conference was resolving that ways must be found to supply all Americans with more and better food. The Gore Amendment, if passed, will act in the opposite direction and make it even more difficult for low-income families to get enough of the proper foods.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, STARK YOUNG; *Washington Editor:* MICHAEL STRAIGHT; *Treasurer:* DANIEL MEBANE; *Assistant Editors:* NIGEL DENNIS, BYRON DEXTER, OTIS FERGUSON, ELIZABETH HULING; *Contributing Editors:* H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, R. G. TUGWELL; *Advertising Manager:* E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

EDITED AND PRODUCED UNDER UNION CONDITIONS BY CONTRACT WITH THE BOOK AND MAGAZINE GUILD, LOCAL 18, UOPWA, CIO

The Lesson of the Bismarck

THIS WAR is not only one of movement rather than of position. It is one in which positions are reversed. If its method on land is surprise, its result on the sea is paradox.

The Germans, the apostles of crushing air attack, have so far failed to sink or even cripple a capital ship by bombing; but they have destroyed the world's biggest fighting unit by the gunfire of a capital ship without air support. The British, on the other hand, whose entire faith has been placed upon the capital ship against all challengers, are the only nation so far to have struck telling blows upon capital ships by air or small-boat attacks—at Dakar, upon the *Richelieu*; at Taranto, upon three Italian battleships; off Cape Matapan, upon the new *Vittorio Veneto*; and in the North Atlantic, upon the *Bismarck*.

And the paradox has been confounded by the ardent commentaries of those who see confirmed, in each action afloat, whatever views they happen to hold as to the primacy of sea or air power. Thus *The New York Times* on May 26, in mourning editorially the loss of the *Hood* to a superior battleship, disparaged battleships in general as being less effective than airplanes; and thus *The New York Herald Tribune* two days later, in acclaiming the loss of the *Bismarck* to airplanes, suggested that the British battle fleet had vindicated itself.

That a deadly contest is being waged between air strength and sea strength, everyone knows. The Battle of Crete again has showed it; and the editorial pages and the congressional lobbies more so. Taxpayers about to be billed from eighty to a hundred million dollars for each of seventeen new United States battleships—whose design will not depart radically from those we already have afloat—think nostalgically of the late General Billy Mitchell, the long neglected prophet of air prowess, who regarded battleships chiefly as scrap-iron targets for his boys. The assumption is made that the air arm is the young, vigorous, daring branch, borne upon sky-waves of the future, while the upholders of battlewagons are little more than investors in swollen, inherited and unimproved property—the Vincent Astors of national defense. Gradually this view has become transformed into one that concedes to Germany's aerial power an inevitable triumph over the Anglo-American command of the oceans. But what somewhat confounds it is the fact that the greatest aerial victories at sea so far have been British, while the most formidable maritime victory has been German.

The real blue-water fight—as the nations wage it—is not merely one between air and sea. It is one between rival sea forces, some of which are in the air. Now Britain, with seven aircraft-carriers in commission, has

more sea forces in the air than Germany; while Germany—which up to last week had one-fourth of the battleship strength of Britain—has been seizing the initiative at sea as no inferior power ever dared before.

Thus the question which the *Bismarck* drama raises is not so much one of sea v. air as it is one of the use and evaluation of forces that are based upon the high seas. The categories of fighting ships have not changed since the First World War; even the aircraft carrier—a primitive version of it—was used at Jutland. Eleven of Britain's fifteen capital units are actually veterans of 1918 (and so, in design at least, are twelve of America's seventeen); they cannot be more than partially rebuilt; but they can be redispersed; their job can be replanned; out of old categories, new forces can be mustered.

Take the British battleship *Warspite*. In the First World War she performed only once—at Jutland, where she was brigaded with twenty-eight other battleships and supported and screened by battle cruisers, armored and light cruisers and destroyers. She was not risked upon forays or convoys; as a mainstay of British sea power, she generally rode at anchor in Scapa, growing barnacles and waiting for the Germans, who meanwhile grew barnacles in Kiel.

In this war, in April of last year, the *Warspite*—elderly, but still treasured—was dispatched upon the dangerous, solitary mission of blasting the Nazi destroyer force out of Narvik fjord. She ran a gauntlet of mines, torpedoes and narrow channels; Winston Churchill later admitted he had been reckless in his orders; but the *Warspite* did the job.

Here was a new conception of the use of the capital ship. In part, of course, it was based on the fact that in this war the Germans had only the briefest battle line to put into action; yet, even so, the British units numbered half of what they had in 1914; Italian intervention was threatened; and English power was thinly scattered. The employment of the *Warspite* foreshadowed the tactics the Germans were brilliantly to employ on land within a month: risk; attack; movement; break-up of the classic "line"; impatience with the war of position and attrition; hunt for a quick decision.

The Germans adopted the new battleship tactics—as soon as they had any battleships. Had the *Bismarck* belonged to the Kaiser's navy, she would probably never have ventured out beyond Heligoland Bight. It would have been said that the North Sea coast must be protected. But by 1941 it had become clear that a hostile fleet could do nothing against a shore watched over by first-class aviation; and thus the *Bismarck* was sent out within a few months of her shake-down trials.

Let us look at the naval panorama as it appeared in the middle of May. There was no German High Seas Fleet, as there once had been: the Nazis' two battle cruisers were lying—or had recently been lying—far out at Brest, where they had been straddled several times by RAF bombs; one pocket battleship either was in the Indian Ocean, or was returning from it; the other was possibly in home waters. The great Tirpitz was not yet ready for service; and the Bismarck, Germany's sole mainstay, sped out to the far north.

On England's side, no vast aggregation such as in 1914-18 was lurking in the Orkneys or at Cromarty. Just as trench warfare had disappeared from land action, so the mighty, immobilized squadrons of another day had broken up into small striking forces scattered about the seas. At the moment, possibly four battleships were working out of Alexandria, trying to save Crete; the Renown lay at Gibraltar; one ship was believed to be shadowing the devious Frenchmen of Dakar; the ponderous Rodney was out convoying in mid-Atlantic; many miles from her, upon a similar task, steamed the old Ramillies; two units had come to America for repairs; at least one lay at home for overhaul; and a maximum of five were left for the defense of the British Isles.

At this moment air reconnaissance reported that the Bismarck—a greater ship than any under Britain's flag—was about to put to sea from Norway. What could be her plan? Atlantic commerce-raiding? A stab at the lonely Faroes, to gain a foothold in the north? A strike at the Irish coast? Or possibly a mere diversion to draw off the fleet? Or—a last possibility—an attempt to force a landing, with still hidden transports, in Iceland?

Probably every unit remaining to England's Home Fleet, together with its cruiser and destroyer screen, was now ordered out. The old Hood and the new Prince of Wales, with an aircraft carrier not far behind them, were rushed to Iceland waters; the flagship King George V probably hovered north of the Orkneys; the mid-Atlantic ships were given the alarm.

The events that followed dismayed and thrilled a world. The Bismarck charged to Iceland to stalk a convoy; blasted a superior battle force; fled before cruisers; failed to track down the nearby carrier Victorious, and was herself tracked down by the carrier's torpedo planes; escaped again, streaking tell-tale oil across the North Atlantic; almost dodged the battleships that were now rushing from every station; was spotted once more by plane, was wounded by a second carrier, and was thrown to the pack.

What is proved by this battle—the most far-flung at sea in our time, and perhaps the most prophetic? On one side it demonstrates that a single big ship, when turned loose upon the ocean, can act as the equivalent of a Panzer force on land, not attacking by frontal assault but rather outflanking, confusing, striking

through, and not giving the enemy time for the orderly evolutions of classic battle. She may be commerce-raider and capital ship at once; and her presence will force a whole fleet to drop whatever else it is doing and to spread out in a posse, in the course of which its separate hunters may run afoul of their daring quarry.

But the battle also shows that such a ship, while able easily to shake off her surface pursuers in mist and night, is highly vulnerable to detection and attack by air. Here the positions become reversed: the raider against sea power now herself becomes a defensive sea citadel against air-raids. The answer is clear: a Panzer force at sea requires air support no less than does a Panzer force on land.

But what is air support at sea? The Italians, operating in closed waters, believed it could be managed by planes based on land. But by the time their fleet reached Cape Matapan—400 miles from home—the distance had grown too great for land-based plane escort, and the ships fell into Admiral Cunningham's trap. Out at sea, then, air support must mean support by aircraft carriers.

Now a carrier, tall, broad, unarmored, is fatally vulnerable—to torpedoes, as was the Courageous; to shell-fire, as was the Glorious; to air-bombs, as was the Illustrious. She cannot be used merely as an escort who will support a raider; she needs to be supported herself. Cruisers must screen her; destroyers must hover about her as she pulls into the wind to let go her squadrons; she performs at her best when riding securely behind a division of battleships, and sending her planes out over them. Thus the aircraft carrier, which wins battles from the air, in turn depends upon sea power. She cannot exist without sea power. She *is* sea power.

True, a long-range bomber based on the coast may soar a hundred miles to sea and there try to find and then to hit an enemy. But it cannot tarry long out there in its attempt. It has got to get home. It cannot stage the repeated come-and-go attacks from nearby that make carrier-borne planes so devastating. With its high cost and complexity, it cannot take the heavy toll—sometimes as high as 50 percent—which good anti-aircraft gunnery at sea sometimes exacts. The plane that does damage at sea has got to come down at sea—that is, on deck.

Thus the naval contest of the Atlantic is not one simply between air and sea strength. It is one between the raider who darts out for stabs at sea, and the fleet which is designed to keep the sea. And in this contest, command of the air goes to the side of the fleet. The success of aerial torpedoes against the Bismarck did not prove that an airplane can cripple or sink a battleship; but it did prove that an aircraft carrier can cripple or sink a battleship.

America's strength in battleships, along with the exuberant publicity given to American battleship con-

struction, has tended to obscure the fact that our navy was the first in the world to decide that the battleship was as vulnerable an object as the great Bismarck later proved herself to be. Twenty years ago, the navy began specializing in the aircraft carrier; today, we lead the world in that category: against our force, of six craft of superb efficiency (with twelve more to come) the Japanese can pit seven, but of smaller capacity and range; the Germans, two; the Italians, none. An American admiral's dream is to accompany each of his battleships by a carrier: and it is interesting, in view of possible American Atlantic operations, that at least three carriers have now been transferred to this coast, to support a battleship strength of only four or five.

Perhaps, more correctly, the admiral's dream is that his battleships shall accompany his carriers. It may be that, as speed, mobility and a world theatre nullify old massed, cumbersome armadas, we are watching not only the decline of former strongholds of strength, but also the emergence of new tactics based on what we already have. The carrier, once the escort, now itself becomes the striking power; the battleship, its supporting artillery; the cruiser, its outpost; the destroyer, its flanking force.

Our cadets are still being trained in the lore of line, column, echelon; but the missions upon which the navy may soon be sent will have little to do with such Nelsonian studies. Our strategic problem is not so much to meet the enemy in fleet combat as it is to keep his raiders from marauding and establishing bases. Our ships must be able to steam upon long sweeps at a radius of about 2,500 miles from Pearl Harbor (an arc that swings from the Bering Sea to Samoa); from the Panama Canal (an arc from Lower California to Santiago); and from Trinidad (an arc that takes in the bulge of Brazil). The fleet—although the task will strain it—is able to do all this. But it will not do it in massed formations. It can't. Should shooting begin, we may expect to see small, compact, balanced American striking formations that will consist of perhaps two battleships each, one aircraft carrier, half a dozen cruisers, and a destroyer squadron. Such combinations would not fight fleet actions. They would scour the sea for raiders—a Tirpitz, a German-manned Littorio, or a party of Japanese Kongos. And with their air strength as their bulwark, they could themselves raid the raider, and seize command of his island or African bases.

WILLIAM HARLAN HALE

Georgia Bottleneck

Washington, April 30.—By a six-to-five vote, the House Rules Committee today gave right of way to the Vinson compulsory-mediation bill. . . .

SO BEGAN a special dispatch to The New York Times, and so might begin any report on legislation pending in the House. The six-to-five vote of the Rules Committee, six votes admittedly in the vest pocket of Representative Gene Cox of Georgia, is the most important vote in Congress today. It is the legislative bottleneck.

To understand the extraordinary powers of the Rules Committee you must go back to the reign of Speaker Cannon, against whose dictatorship Congress, with reason, rose in wrath. To curb Cannon, the complicated set-up of the Rules Committee was devised; and it worked for freedom until a canny politician, John Nance Garner, packed the committee with his own favorites. For the last half-dozen years, Southerners on the Rules Committee have applied the fancy regulations of the legislative manual with the smoothness of a Southern election committee disqualifying a reliefer unable to read. When the Rules Committee says No, Congress can't vote either.

The trouble is, you have to have some regulation of debate, and some way to sort the thousands of bills introduced every session. Out of 17,007 bills offered the Seventy-fifth Congress, 1,758 were enacted—and

as almost half of these were "private" bills, for pensions or claims, the mortality in legislative measures is roughly eighteen to one. After the first weeding-out in other committees, the Rules Committee has the power of the second death.

Then, particularly in time of emergency, it is necessary to plan the House program and put some limit on discussion. The Rules Committee does that. In fact it does it so well that the author of unwanted legislation may find himself barred from speaking for it when at last it reaches the floor.

It is as a gleeful executioner of New Deal legislation and a sponsor of nullifying amendments, riders and miscellaneous nuisances that the Rules Committee, of late years, has chosen to act. So skillfully does the present membership manipulate the manual that there is no handicap in the fact that Mr. Cox, admitted boss of the committee, isn't even its chairman. These Southerners know how to manage behind the scenes, and the committee is capable of going into unadvertised executive sessions, early in the morning, at almost any time.

Representative Cox—Judge Cox to his friends—first made the front pages of Northern newspapers in 1939, when he was asked by a representative of the Workers' Alliance to vote favorably on a WPA appropriation. Mr. Cox retorted, somewhat wide of the point, that two Negro constituents who accompanied the Alliance spokesman would be better off back home behind

a plow. The Alliance man said: "We'll remember that at the next election," whereupon the Representative, a man of impulse, slapped the critic's face.

Actually, the Alliance man's threat was vain, because a prospective voter in that state must pay a dollar admission to the polls, as well as pay up other taxes, have his color recorded on the election rolls, and either satisfy examiners of his ability to read and write or be the owner of forty acres or five hundred dollars. Mr. Cox gave it as his opinion that the Georgia legislature would oppose, 10-to-1, any proposal to alter the election laws. Doubtless he was right; although Georgia got as far as ratifying the Bill of Rights in 1939, the legislature has lately voted to prohibit collection of union fees on defense projects, and has passed some unique anti-alien legislation.

Several gentlemen from Georgia have sponsored anti-labor and anti-alien legislation in Congress, but Representative Cox easily emerges from the ruck of Southern Democrats as a man of action and resource. A personal friend of Garner, he made no secret of his support of Cactus Jack's policies and presidential ambitions; asked his choice between a New Deal and a Republican victory in 1940, he pondered deeply and then said, "I would like to see my party win, but I put the welfare of the country ahead of party."

The welfare of the country is naturally identified by Mr. Cox with that of the two percent of the people who elect him. Anybody likely to go to Congress from Camilla, Georgia, Mr. Cox's home town, would have been born knowing that white men are naturally superior to Negroes, that people who work with their heads and wear white collars are naturally superior to people who work with their hands and wear torn shirts, and that the latter good-for-nothings can't be trusted with money. In Camilla you would know that the place for money is a bank, from which funds may be taken for investment in mills or other industry, but you would consider such investment sound only if it did not squander money in high payrolls. You would know that ideas contrary to these could only be introduced into our country by alien agitators. And you would cling to and fight for these respectable ideas with extra vigor in order to prove that a citizen of Camilla, Georgia, is as good as anybody else. (To Northerners it must be explained that rural Georgia is looked down upon by the rest of that state.)

The interest of Georgia congressmen in labor legislation is thus practical and personal. A case in point is the action of Representative Malcolm C. Tarver of Dalton, Georgia, who persuaded the subcommittee charged with Labor Department finance to delete the appropriation for wages-and-hours law enforcement, when he failed to obtain exemption for north Georgia's nickel-an-hour candlewick-bedspread industry.

In Mr. Cox's district, a federal judge imposed fines of only \$250 on the Camilla Hosiery Mill and its president for paying women workers less than the legal

two bits an hour, and falsifying records to cover violations which saved the mill some \$3,000. More recently the Mitchell County draft board announced its intention of deferring local operation of the draft "until the government stops these strikes."

So successful are these local rebellions that you might think Mr. Cox wouldn't worry about laws passed to govern the rest of the country; but he is an energetic patriot, a man of conviction and principle, anxious to see right prevail even in other regions. Rules Committee action against the wages-and-hours legislation has, therefore, been consistent. Back in the



Black-Connery days, the committee successfully delayed action and then compelled the House to defeat a string of amendments of which one, offered by Rules Committeeman Martin Dies, was typical: the Dies amendment would have permitted overtime in the case of emergency work, charitably defined as "any work... made necessary in the due course and conduct

of production and to avoid undue disruption of business." Later, Mr. Cox and his committee backed the Barden bill against the Norton bill, fought efforts to suspend the rules in order to consider the latter, and threatened to keep other measures off the House floor until the Barden bill should be considered. This year the fight between the Labor Committee chairman and the Rules Committee has continued, with Mr. Cox supporting the Vinson bill and making threats about "the army marching in and taking over" if it is not enacted.

It must be admitted that Mr. Cox is less successful in sponsoring than in smothering bills; the Barden bill could not be forced on the House and those provisions of the Vinson bill which embody Georgia principles are not expected to survive. But House action to set aside a Rules Committee gag is very rare indeed, and thus the committee has defeated, with little difficulty, housing bills and others of social importance. Asked about one housing bill long overdue, Mr. Cox said "We may never vote on it," and he was right.

The Rules Committee has also been a helpful friend to the special committees appointed to harass New Deal agencies, and to the Dies Committee. Supporting the Smith investigation of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Cox said simply, "The board and its entire army of wreckers must go." This spring, with time on the floor allotted with a stop watch to lease-lend arguments, he took a few precious minutes to make sure that his fellow committee member, Mr. Dies, would receive his new appropriation on time. This action by

Mr. Cox was especially interesting because, as a reference to The Congressional Record for February 5, 1941, will show, he spoke in the absence of and without consultation with the nominal chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative Sabath of Illinois.

Such are the Cox powers that the gentleman from Georgia might well say, "Let me make the rules for the House, and let who will write its laws." It is a curious political quirk which places such power, increased by the present emergency, in the hands of an open opponent of the administration.

Asked his chief objection to the New Deal, Mr. Cox said it wasn't so much the New Deal spending; what his conscience couldn't tolerate was the tendency to socialize America. At the time he made this objection, it was estimated that members of Mr. Cox's family were engaged in government work bringing in a total of \$56,500 a year in salaries. His son, Lamar Cox, was earning \$4,800 a year as counsel for that socialistic agency, the Electric Home and Farm Authority. His brother, Ode E. Cox, was drawing \$3,900 as assistant disbursing clerk of the House. A nephew, Charles M.

Cox, drew down a \$3,800 salary as an administrative officer of the AAA. Another nephew, a clerk, in the Library of Congress, was making \$1,620; a third, an SEC clerk, was paid \$1,740. One of the Judge's sisters served as his secretary, at \$3,380 a year; another got the job of postmistress back in Camilla, at \$200 a month. A brother-in-law, assistant in the House document room, rated \$1,860. The best pickings in the family connection were reserved for a son-in-law, chief architect on two United States housing projects down in Macon (already provided for when Mr. Cox held up the housing bill). Twenty-three thousand dollars was the son-in-law's share of fees for this job. Add in the Representative's own \$10,000 salary, and you get the total of \$56,500 for ten members of the Cox family, referred to by Washington wits as Cox's army.

After an enterprising political observer totted up this total, Mr. Cox found temporary employment for his youngest daughter as a House page. But that was just in fun; the money she made wouldn't count to anybody, unless maybe to a Negro on relief.

WILLSON WHITMAN

Nutrition for National Defense

IF ONE POINT was hammered home by the first National Nutrition Conference for Defense, held May 26 to 28 in Washington, it was the challenge to "him that hath." The facts that place the United States in the role of "him that hath," as regards nutrition resources, formed a fitting curtain-raiser to the main business of the Conference. The 900 leaders, called together by Paul V. McNutt, Federal Coördinator of Health and Welfare, and the Federal Nutrition Advisory Committee, had come to map out a campaign of action on this major sector of all-out national defense; and they stuck to that task.

Over-all issues, as presented at the general sessions, blocked out the tremendous scope of the nutrition problem: first, to make America strong by making Americans stronger; second, to make available as much food as we can as a weapon of defense for all the democracies and in particular Great Britain; third, to lay the groundwork for the far-reaching benefits which in future years may accrue from our present efforts.

The composite picture presented at these meetings left no question that the United States has the makings of maximum nutrition for all—more capacity to produce needed foods than perhaps any other single nation; a national income that ought, by any standard, to keep everyone's head above even the "hidden hunger" level; broad and increasing scientific knowledge of what makes good food "good"; practical ingenuity in applying scientific knowledge to the processing, preservation and preparation of foods; a continental system

of transportation and distribution unequalled elsewhere; nationwide channels of public information and education through schools, radio, press and periodicals, motion pictures, libraries, health centers and innumerable voluntary groups; and, finally, a trained nutrition army, already numbering some thousands.

Actually, the conferees agreed, the people of this country probably were better fed than those of any other nation even before war devastated so much of the world. And it seems certain that in spite of the present emergency, we need not suffer from serious food shortages. In the words of Vice President Wallace:

Apparently we shall not have to cut down our own food needs in order to make sure that there is a surplus to send to our friends across the sea. The problem is to use our soil, our farmers, our processors, our distributors and our knowledge to produce the maximum of abounding health as a broad foundation on which we can build all the rest of our hemisphere defense.

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard amplified this point: "Agricultural adjustments can be made upward as well as downward, according to need. Adjustments are being made upward for some products right now in the new agricultural policy designed to furnish food for Great Britain and safeguard our own domestic needs." These increases, he stated, are in eggs, milk, canned tomatoes, dried beans and pork.

"But," he pointed out, "these are some of the very products that we would need to produce in greater

abundance to give everyone in the United States a satisfactory diet. In order to achieve such a goal, it has been figured out that we would need to consume twice as much green vegetables and fruits as we do now; 70 percent more tomatoes and citrus fruits; 35 percent more eggs; 15 percent more butter; 20 percent more milk."

In spite of all this country has to its credit, this and other evidence weighs down the debit side of the nutrition ledger. Something more than 40 percent of the American people are not getting enough food and the right kind of food to maintain health and vigor—and this in spite of the fact that the foods of which we have a so-called surplus are the very ones they need. Less than one-fourth are getting a really good diet, even when measured by lower standards than those to which we would subscribe today. Secretary of Labor Perkins, Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Adviser in the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, Mr. McNutt and others added detailed testimony as to that third or more of the nation which remains ill fed—because of lack of money and lack of knowledge. Dr. Henry C. Sherman, professor of Nutrition at Columbia University, pointed out that if everyone had an *adequate* diet, instead of an *average* diet, ten years could be added to our active life span.

But perhaps the most dramatic evidence of what poor nutrition may mean to a nation came from General Louis B. Hershey, Deputy Director of the Selective Service System. He reported that out of a million young men given physical examinations, "a total of 380,000 have been found unfit for general military service under present standards." He estimated that "perhaps one-third of the rejections were due either directly or indirectly to nutritional deficiencies. In terms of men, the army today has been deprived of 150,000 who should have been able to do duty as soldiers. This is 15 percent of the total number physically examined by the Selective Service System."

If people who now can spend only five cents a meal for food could spend ten cents, another 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 acres of farm land would have to be devoted to food production—and our food expenditures would increase by about two billion dollars. Add to this the acute British needs, and it becomes essential that we direct our agriculture to producing more of the nutritionally needed foods.

Evidence of long standing need weighed as heavily in the Conference planning as the emergency demands of national defense. We are still, it was agreed, paying for the nutritional losses of past years. The increasing wage levels of today will not by themselves put a chicken—and all that nutritionists know should go with it—into every pot.

"How can that be done? How can defense workers and the people at large capitalize on our potentially abundant national food supply?" The special sessions

of the Conference asked themselves these questions, and set out to answer them in terms of research and education, public health and medicine, processing, distribution and community planning, economic and social policy.

Some steps have already been taken. Free school lunches have been provided for 5,000,000 undernourished children; but there are at least as many others in equal need. Food stamps, through which every food dollar of relief money is stretched to provide extra buying power, have proved an effective method of bringing surplus foods to needy families. But this plan now reaches only about one-half the families on relief. Low-cost milk is available in only a few communities. All of these measures can and should be extended.

Science and industry have recently made outstanding contributions. The Food and Nutrition Committee of the National Research Council, with Dr. Russell M. Wilder of the Mayo Clinic as chairman, has set up our first authoritative measure of what a good diet should provide in the way of vitamins as well as calories. Expressed in terms of essential food elements, this standard can be translated into easily available foods for any part of the country, and its sliding scale adjusted to the needs of different age groups and occupations. In general a daily diet which would measure up to this nutritional "gold standard" would include: One pint of milk for an adult and more for a child; a serving of meat (and cheaper cuts are just as nutritious); one egg or some suitable substitute such as navy beans; two vegetables, one of which should be green or yellow; two fruits, one of which should be rich in vitamin C, found abundantly in citrus fruits and tomatoes; some butter or oleomargarine with vitamin A added; breads, flour and cereal, most, or preferably all, whole grain or enriched.

Enriched flour and bread—perhaps the most frequently discussed item on the Conference agenda—are also an accomplished fact, thanks to the coöperative efforts of governmental agencies and the milling and baking industries. These products are already on the market; the standards have been approved and are to become generally effective as soon as practicable—probably on January 1.

These are some of the steps already taken in giving effect to our present knowledge of nutrition. We do not yet know the whole story; for malnutrition, like an iceberg, is nine-tenths submerged. Though only one in ten may have acute symptoms of deficiency disease, the under-cover mass of malnutrition may well prove even more dangerous than its overt manifestations.

Both what we know and what we do not yet know should spur us on to further effort. Certainly that was the consensus of opinion throughout the entire Conference, as it has been the point of view of the Nutrition Advisory Committee which over long months has laid the ground work for last week's work. Much of

the success of the Conference was due to the patient and effective effort of the committee chairman, Dr. M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension Work of the Department of Agriculture.

Scientists, educators, farmers, distributors, consumers, and public officials might not always be in detailed agreement on methods, on lines of attack, or on emphasis. But the final recommendations, arrived at by the democratic processes of group give-and-take, represent basic practical next steps. Presented at the closing session of the Conference by Dr. Wilson, they were unanimously adopted. In brief they call for:

1. The use of the standards prepared by the Committee on Food and Nutrition, both as the general goal for good nutrition in the United States and as the yardstick by which to measure progress.
2. Translation of these allowances, and other technical material, into terms of everyday foods and appetizing meals suitable for families and individuals at different economic levels.
3. Vigorous and continuous research to add to our present knowledge of all aspects of nutrition.
4. More widespread education in nutrition of doctors, dentists, social-service workers, teachers, etc.
5. The mobilization of every educational method to reach laymen by means of the schools, motion pictures, the radio, the public press, home and community demonstrations and all other suitable means.
6. Mobilization of all neighborhood, community, state and national organizations and services that can contribute in any way to raising the nutritional level of the people. The State Nutrition Committees can be especially useful in this connection.
7. Vigorous and continued attack on the fundamental problems of unemployment, insecure employment and rates of pay inadequate to maintain an American standard of living.
8. Full use of any practical devices, such as the Food Stamp Plan, free school lunches and low-cost milk distribution, which will bring nourishing, adequate meals to those who could not otherwise afford them, and at the same time help to distribute food surpluses at a fair return to the farmer.
9. Efforts to improve food distribution, including processing, marketing, packaging and labeling, to bring about greater real economies for the consumer. These efforts would include vigorous prosecution of illegal practices.
10. Encouragement in all practical ways of greater production of the foods needed in more abundance—milk and milk products, eggs, vegetables, fruits and, in the case of many families, lean meats.
11. Encouragement in every practical way of more production for home use by rural people, especially those at low income levels.
12. The "enrichment" of certain staple food products, such as flour and bread, with nutritive elements that have been removed by modern milling and refining processes.

Speaking for myself and for the United States Public Health Service, I subscribe heartily to these pro-

posals. And looking to the job ahead, I would wish only to amplify some of their implications.

In connection with extension of the Food Stamp Plan, I suggest that better nutrition of human beings rather than removal of surplus products should be the consideration that shapes the job. I also suggest that if it becomes necessary for us to conserve certain foods more needed by our allies and ourselves, the administrative machinery of the Food Stamp Plan could be put into reverse overnight in order to ensure the most equitable consumption of such foods in proportion to need, not in proportion to buying power. If the Food Stamp Plan or some comparable device were in operation throughout the country, it could be extended to other nutritionally needy families, who now are without the foods essential to good health.

Then, too, we must remember the great strategic importance of food in the worldwide struggle of today. A. A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, brought home vividly to the Conference the fact that food, because of its impact upon economic conditions and the morale of a people, has been used by aggressor nations as an instrument of war, an instrument for subjugating whole populations.

That force may also, one day, be used for peace as a foundation stone in an after-war world economy. Present Anglo-American coöperation in food for defense, involving, as it should, intimate coöperation among the United Kingdom, the British Commonwealths, the United States and the other American Republics, may lay the basis for a world policy to meet this elemental need. This is only a hope of the future. Toward the realization of that hope, both our obligations to the world as "him that hath" in relation to food resources, and our task of utilizing those resources to improve our own nutrition will point the way.

Nutrition for national defense is a great objective. But things do not get themselves done merely because they need doing. I hope that, when he has received the report of this conference, the President may see fit to make this task the sole responsibility of a competent body, acting through the Coördinator of Health and Welfare as an operating agency. Its task would be the immediate nationwide application of all our resources to the human needs of this unlimited emergency. I would hope that science, education, industry and all government agencies directly concerned will share in the responsibility for the job ahead—the immediate job of building a stronger, a more competent, a more intelligent America, prepared for whatever the future may hold.

In the words with which Mrs. Roosevelt closed the Conference, "This is the job we have to do *now*. And don't let anyone tell you that this country cannot do what it has to do—in military defense and in defense at home."

Washington

THOMAS PARRAN, M. D.

Conscientious Objectors in Britain

SOMETIMES a nation does learn from experience. The British record in the treatment of conscientious objectors during the last war is not the pleasantest page in the history of this island: it could have been a great deal worse, but it ought to have been a great deal better. This time it is very much better, and the credit belongs to Neville Chamberlain, who showed in this matter a humane common sense that Mr. Lloyd George lacked. Chamberlain understood that if a man is compelled to make a show of fighting in violation of his conscience, not only will he fight poorly, if he fights at all: he will demoralize all around him. From the start he resolved that this time there should be no coercion of rebellious consciences and he said so bluntly. What is more important, he used the experience painfully won in the last war: this time the law was more far-sighted and elastic, and it provided not merely local tribunals to hear pleas for exemption from military service, but also four appeal tribunals to check their decisions.

The problem is not simple. Conscientious objectors are always by temperament or tradition individualists, but they have nothing else in common. Some draw the line only against taking human life with their own hands, but they are willing to work with a pen or a spade in uniform in the army. Others refuse to take the military oath, but they will gladly serve the community as agricultural laborers. Some are men of spirit who volunteer for the most dangerous tasks open to them: they will sweep mines at sea, fight fires in an air raid, or attend the wounded on the battlefield. Some will serve under military discipline in the Royal Army Medical Corps, others only in a civilian Quaker ambulance unit. For all these gradations of principle, some of them resting on casuistical niceties, the law has tried to find a solution, and commonly with success. The tribunals may exempt a resolute "absolutist" unconditionally from any form of service whatever, but if a man fails to convince them that he has a "conscientious objection," they may send him into the combatant ranks of the army. But two compromises are open between these extremes; the tribunals may place the objector in the non-combatant ranks of the army, or they may prescribe for him civilian work of "national importance" such as agriculture, forestry or the merchant marine.

The graver difficulty is to measure the urgency and sincerity of a man's conscience. Here, as one would expect, the local tribunals differ widely in toleration and comprehension. Fortunately the four appeal tribunals have often corrected their mistakes: of the appeals 41 percent were successful. Even conservative Englishmen feel a deep respect for Quakers and in general are tolerant toward religious pacifists. But about half of these

belonged to the Church of England or the Methodist Church: it was often difficult for a very young man to prove that he had long held unorthodox views about war. The more eccentric sects raised some odd problems. Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, if I grasp their view correctly, are eager to fight under the Lord of Hosts at Armageddon, but they will not fight under any less distinguished general in any premature campaign. Those who had an ethical objection to war fared rather worse, especially if they were agnostics, and the political objectors worst of all, especially if they were socialists. Tribunals would usually give a man some relief if he could prove that he objected to all wars, whatever his reason might be. The trouble began when he wanted to choose his war: that, it was commonly held, was a matter not of "conscience" but of "expediency." In other words, conscience in the traditional English view speaks in categorical imperatives. The law gave no guidance here, for it included no definitions. Communists do not lay claim to the liberty of private judgment, but the Independent Labor Party does, and some of its members failed to convince their tribunals that their distaste for "imperialist wars" is a case of conscience. But a few were fortunate. I know of one case where a man who had fought in the International Brigades in Spain received exemption. But the political objectors were a small minority: about nine percent.

A few figures that give the dimensions of the problem may interest Americans. The total number of men who claimed exemption on the score of a conscientious objection to war amounted, up to January, 1941, to 53,000. The proportion varies in the different age groups: the highest percentage is two: not a large figure when one remembers that pacifists have had for several years in the Peace Pledge Union a very active organization. The local tribunals dealt with objectors as follows: 6 percent received unconditional exemption; 37 percent were required to perform some civilian work of national importance, and 30 percent were sent to non-combatant service in the army. That is to say, 73 percent were held to be genuine cases. The remaining 27 percent failed to convince the tribunals. Some submitted: some resisted and others attained better terms when they appealed to the national tribunals.

What happened to those who resisted? They do not appear to be numerous. The latest figures obtainable show that only thirty-seven objectors spent Christmas in prison. One wishes that there had been none at all, but this modest total serves to show how relatively well the system has worked in this war. Last time 6,312 men were arrested, and of these 816 spent more than two years in prison. Nor is that all. In the last war a systematic attempt was made to break the will of the

more obstinate objectors by brutal and humiliating punishments. Some were even sent to France and there subjected to the notorious "field-punishment" commonly known as "crucifixion." Seven were sentenced to be shot, though this martyrdom was promptly commuted to ten years' imprisonment. Such stupidities are a thing of the past. In very few instances, so far as is known, were they attempted this time: seven objectors who had been sent into the army were beaten up and otherwise humiliated at Liverpool: for this exploit one

officer and six non-commissioned officers were court-martialed. But the reader must not conclude that even in England pacifists lead an easy life when they choose to defy a nation fighting for survival. Social and economic penalties await them, even if the law is lenient. Civil servants are not penalized, but many municipalities, many business firms and, I regret to say, the BBC, dismiss their pacifist employees.

H. N. BRAILSFORD

London

Hitler's American Dream

AMERICA's minister to Belgium when there was a Belgium, Mr. Cudahy, was recently granted an interview by Goebbels. The Nazi propaganda lord assured our greatly impressed statesman-reporter that Americans need not fear German intentions. The Nazi General Staff, it seems, had canvassed all possibilities and concluded that an invasion of America was not feasible.

It was a curious statement and a curious interview. You need not fear my intentions, I say to you. I have seriously canvassed the possibilities of assault with intent to kill, but it won't succeed.

Why did Goebbels take the trouble to exercise his charm and exert his intellect on an American? He was not chatting out of ennui. He knew that in the battle of opinion in America the legions whose views on the war he favors expose their most vulnerable flank here: if Britain goes down, America will have to face the Nazi power, whatever its intent, alone. Hence his anxiety to reassure us.

But we must not be content merely with seeing Goebbels as manipulator and Cudahy as dupe. The argument itself must be confronted. And I have grown ever less satisfied recently with the form which this sort of discussion has taken. I have been reading Lindbergh and John T. Flynn, who say that America cannot be invaded. And I have also read the letters by divers military authorities in *The New Republic* of May 12 saying that an invasion of America is possible. I find myself more convinced than ever that it is, and yet curiously unsatisfied about the question itself. Obviously the clearest answer is that if the Nazis smash British sea power and annex its residues to existing German, Italian, French and Japanese sea power, our naval position becomes impossible. Even should we eventually get a two-ocean navy we would no longer, as Samuel Grafton suggests, have any oceans to float it on. When Hitler wins, the Atlantic becomes a Nazi lake, the Monroe Doctrine becomes untenable, Latin America is opened to Nazi power and falls away from us, and through Latin America there begins an economic, political, ideological and military penetration of America by

Nazi power. In the shadow of that power we should have to live until either we confronted it directly through war or it overcame us through civil war.

Make no mistake about it. If the Nazis intend to attack us after they have disposed of Britain, they will find a means, direct or indirect—probably the latter. Their armory of means has proved inexhaustibly various and resourceful. That is why the more important question is, What is their intent? Does Hitler mean to move against us? The political intuition of most Americans says that he does, that his designs for empire do not stop at the boundaries of Europe. But how much basis has this intuition?

To start with the obvious, the recent protestations of Hitler and his propaganda lords have no reliability. In fact, they have a negative reliability: the fact that they are made should put us on our guard. Most of Hitler's invasions have been preceded by a promise not to invade. He is a master of the political lie. That is a matter for the record. I wish someone would send Mr. Cudahy that record, as contained for example in Frederick L. Schuman's documented "Europe on the Eve" and "Night over Europe."

Yet the argument persists: Hitler wanted *Lebensraum* for Germany, hence his broken promises; with the defeat of Britain he will have it, hence he will stop. Let us examine this. In the Nazi drive for expansion there have been other logical stopping-points. Hitler might have stopped after regaining the European territory Germany lost at Versailles. He did not. He might have stopped later, after supposedly reuniting the German minorities on the Continent in a Pan-Germanic racial entity. He did not. He might stop now, as Lindbergh suggests, after a successful bid for European hegemony, and live side by side with the remaining imperialisms elsewhere. But why should we assume he will stop here, when in the past he has gone on despite an equal logic for stopping?

The fact is that even if he had an inclination to call a halt at the full tide of victory, there are forces within the Nazi system itself that would prevent him. We

should be blind to the workings of that system if we did not see in it a compulsive expansionism.

And first, the Nazi economy requires war if it is not to shift to some other kind of economy, perhaps a more purely socialist variety. I am not one of those who lump the Nazi with other controlled economies as indifferently "managerial" structures. The technicians are, to be sure, in control in Germany, but the economic system is still potentially explosive unless the business groups, the army groups and the government bureaucrats are all at least marginally satisfied. Ever since he came into power Hitler has used war and preparation for war as a way of driving a wedge between business and the army, to keep them from uniting against him. He has offered the army a world to win, and he has offered business full capacity today in war orders plus pie tomorrow in the new regions opened for industrial exploitation. Once he stopped he would have on his hands a restless army and a business group that called on him to fulfill his promises. And here he would be caught between the danger on the one hand of a business economy with its restrictionism, and on the other hand of a socialist economy with its equalitarianism. Either would set up internal tensions within the regime—tensions that Hitler has ridiculed in other social systems and that would be dangerous to his own power.

One might argue here that this ultimate reckoning might be long postponed by the tasks and the opportunities of organizing a European Nazi economy. And the facts recently revealed in PM and elsewhere indicate that such an economy is already on its way. But it would be a mistake to regard it as merely a form of economic regionalism. If it is true that Hitler can avoid internal social problems only by maintaining his national economy as a war economy, so it is also true that he can maintain his type of power over a Nazified Europe only by projecting his European economy into a world economy. We must remember that for Hitler, as for Spengler, economics is only a branch of politics—the economics of force. Hitler must use his European economy as a weapon, not for peaceful competition with other imperialist systems but for domination of them. The present Nazi economy requires war to prevent economic democracy; the Greater Nazi economy will require war because it must operate on a world scale.

Moving up in the Nazi hierarchy, I turn to the nature of the political system and its ideology. Both have ceased to be nationalist. Both envisage a racial and administrative elite in every country which cuts across national lines, all of them tied to a central elite in Berlin. Such a conception is, as has been often pointed out, a world-revolutionary one. Hitlerism is the bastard successor of Trotsky's dream of a "permanent revolution." From Spengler, from Haushofer, from a whole variety of mystico-realists, there sprang Hitler's now famous sentence in "Mein Kampf": "Germany will be either a world power or will not be at all." In that be-

lief the Nazi ruling group has been brought up. Upon it they have pinned their lust for earth and their hope of heaven.

Why should America be exempt from this drive toward world power? Anyone with even the most elementary knowledge of Nazi writings on America (there is a convenient compendium of them in Robert Strausz-Hupe's useful book, "Axis America") knows that we have always hung before Nazi eyes as a succulent prize. To Colin Ross "*unser Amerika*" is an unredeemed German country; to Spengler, in his "Hour of Decision," America is ripe for a revolutionary thrust. Within the confines of those two perspectives lies Hitler's American dream.

I have left to the last Hitler himself. Even if the Nazi system were not inherently expansionist, Hitler would supply its drive. There have been in our literature many underestimates and overestimates of him. But about his megalomania there can be no doubt. And it is Hitler who runs the Nazi show, not the lieutenants. His is the will, the conception, the driving zeal. That is why Hitler, for all our more impersonal analyses, must matter in our reckoning. And his megalomania has caused him to think of himself as a world conqueror and to reserve a special hatred and avidity for America. His own sense of stature will drive him either toward his world goal or to suicide. He has already come as close as Napoleon. Without America his dream cannot be fulfilled.

MAX LERNER

Man in Mirror

He had seen his shadow on the door
Through the same mirror many times before,
But up to now had not perceived in it
A thing so of authority, so fit.
The midnight cup of coffee in his hand,
He'd come with stark attention to a stand
Where mirror, door and lamp on the bookshelf
Contrived this tall, dark profile of himself.
The stoop of shoulders wearily outlined
The weight of sixty years and all mankind.
The shaggy brow marked that electric will
That long had met the burden, met it still.
The careful fingers, cradled round the cup,
Stood symbol for the way he'd taken up
His fellow men, benevolently, to see
Both what they were and could be made to be.
But melancholy was the overtone,
The figure being so slight and bent and lone.
He fluttered inwardly with mortal shock,
And yet it hardly stirred his gray forelock,
For suddenly the shadow seemed to be
Something definitely more than he.

LEGARDE S. DOUGHTY

Washington Notes

Ultimatum to the Axis

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT has declared war on the Axis. His speech of May 28 was an irrevocable commitment to fight the Nazis if they do certain things which they already are doing. We are, in fact, at war with Germany right now. Just when the shooting will start and under what circumstances is still uncertain but little else has been left to speculation. Whether the first shot is fired by a German or an American gunner is a matter of no great consequence. It will draw return fire on either side. Admiral Erich Raeder has served notice through the Japanese press that his command will shoot at American patrol ships if they get in his way; President Roosevelt has announced that they already are under orders to get in his way.

In all probability, the first incident will be Nazi-initiated. The last time the President answered the question, what will the commander of an American warship do if he sees a U-boat stalking a British merchantman? he replied that the skipper would report to him. So far as the public record shows, these are still the American navy's orders. Presumably the Nazis can postpone the start of a shooting war with the United States as long as they keep out of the way of American patrol ships and they may take advantage of this opportunity for weeks or even months to come. But as the range of the American patrol is increased, particularly if it cuts down British shipping losses materially, the Germans will have no choice but to fight American naval forces—or to abandon their campaign against England and risk eventual loss of the war and all they have gained by it so far. There can be little doubt which course Hitler will choose. Actually he is offered no alternative.

He has been told that Dakar, which he already controls, is regarded by the United States as a jumping-off place for attack on the Western Hemisphere, that merely by holding it in the name of his Vichy puppets, he has challenged our policy of national defense. He has been told that he will not find us unconcerned if he moves through Spain and Portugal to Gibraltar. It is too late for him to try to get out of being our enemy. Anything he may think up about his innocence of designs on the Western Hemisphere has been derided in advance. It must be a little disconcerting even to such a resourceful liar as he. As a literary criticism of "Mein Kampf," the President's speech was devastating. That, however, was only an incidental merit. It was a communication to the American people in defense of the administration's foreign policy, in explanation of what has been done, in preparation for what is still to be done. As such, it was probably his greatest state paper.

It was marked with the weeks of anxiety and uncertainty that preceded its preparation, with full realization of the gravity of the decision it revealed, with a maturity of statesmanship tempered in the fire of crisis through eight long years of leadership. It was, more than any other Roosevelt speech, sensitive, modulated, yet unflinching. In it was Churchill's call to blood, sweat and tears, but also the promise of a world worth bleeding and sweating and dying for.

For the duration, no more business and profits and comforts as usual. After the war, back to the task of finishing the social structure for which the New Deal already has laid the foundations and of building similar edifices for the rest of the world's peoples. No return to boom-bust, feast-famine extremes for nations or for individuals. The speech was not definitive of war aims but sufficiently indicative for favorable contrast with Hitler's known objectives.

As for the proclamation of full emergency, it may mean anything or nothing. No lawyer, in or out of the government, can define with any degree of certainty the President's emergency powers although some of these powers have firm constitutional and statutory bases. The power of the President to wage undeclared war by exercise of his powers as commander-in-chief of the army and navy is not subject to doubt. Certain powers over shipping, communication, transport and production also can be exercised in the name of emergency without danger of overstepping the President's authority in time of war or emergency. Beyond these specific authorizations, the power of the President to defend the nation from external enemies is limited only by his own discretion. Lincoln started fighting the Civil War before he knew for sure whether Congress would declare it; he suspended in some cases even the civil liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. He was called a dictator by his Copperhead critics and rebuked by the courts. He explained that he had sworn to defend the Constitution as a whole and that, during the emergency, he had not always found it possible to reconcile defense of the whole with defense of the parts. Wilson threatened to revoke the deferred status of striking defense workers and immediately induct them into the fighting services. Historically, emergency powers have been what wartime Presidents said they were.

The most disturbing statement in the President's address—the statement that "machinery of defense must not be interrupted" by disputes between capital and labor, that mediation machinery must be used "without stoppage of work"—should be read in the light of historical perspective. Obviously, it was a threat to clamp down on all strikes, at least in defense industries. The President has no specific authority in law to prevent dissatisfied workmen from striking, even in time of emergency. But he could probably back up his threat in several ways if put to it: by mobilizing public opinion against strikers, by taking over defense plants and manning them with civil servants or by operating struck factories under the protection of the armed forces. The President's National Mediation Board, which has demonstrated its sympathy for labor, has a remarkable record. The President now proposes that it be given a chance to mediate disputes before they reach the strike stage and that both sides accept its findings as final.

Labor's isolationist minority leaders will, of course, point to this part of the President's speech as proof of their contention that the war emergency is to be used to smash organized labor and strip it of all it has gained. This certainly is not so. On the other hand, William Green and other AFL leaders are probably too impetuous in their rush to accept the President's formula. Both the brickbats and the roses might well be withheld until the forced mediation policy is put to the test of application.

Washington

T. R. B.

Not So Good

MAJOR BARBARA is not just another movie for two reasons, both good: (1) it was made from a play by G. B. Shaw; (2) it is not, in the best use of the word, a movie. To get briefly through the this-and-that, it was made to follow up "Pygmalion," by Gabriel Pascal in England, and is released here through United Artists. Shaw is supposed to have supplied additional dialogue where needed, and the production contains Wendy Hiller, Rex Harrison, Robert Morley, Robert Newton and Emlyn Williams. It represents a sort of culture-by-contact, in that many who wouldn't know the name Shaw learn that there is a name Shaw in England; it runs almost two hours and I'm afraid it's a bore.

G. B. Shaw has always been a delight to me, and surely he is the dean of all intellectual showmen in this language. There isn't a play he has written that doesn't make good reading in some way or other, if only the preface, and his remarks to the press, footnotes to Frank Harris and business letters make up a spry literature all their own. But I doubt if the theatre ever occurred to him as anything but a dinner table at which—by the theatre's arresting glow of lights and actors—you would listen to his ideas, or else. One of the few consistently brilliant minds in writing, whether in advanced theories or in tosh, and a shrewd hand at all the devices (a literary M. C.), he has had no time for that deep and different thing of the true theatre which goes beyond words—because he wanted to talk.

"Major Barbara" may serve today as a comment on the idea that art should have significance sticking out all over it like cloves in a ham first, and the ham after if practicable. It is a play about religious hypocrisy; it says nothing that is untrue and was probably very daring in the early years of the century. But when you take the "about" part away, as the years have taken it, what have you left, outside of a boy-girl movie situation in which neither means much to us? The idea carried it once, the idea and everybody on the stage talking on and on about it. But now the kind of people who will be shocked and still like it can see only platitude; the kind of people who report shocks to the Hays office can stay away, and the people who wait for something real to happen are still waiting when the lights go up.

In the film as it goes from this point to that point, you will see the story of a girl who met a boy. He did something with Greek and she was dedicated to the Salvation Army or something, though her father had everything. She is working with the purest faith and energy to save souls, several of which are character actors in the story, and so naturally he gets involved in that business and incidents happen and are discussed. The final switch is brought about when the girl, Major Barbara, finds that the dirty munitions money of her father is perfectly acceptable to her superiors in this cause of regeneration, and afterwards that the workingmen in the old man's business are happier and more useful as citizens in its benefits, as a going institution, than those she has been concerned with. There have been comments and comedy interludes, but the framework is what you remember in a vague and unsatisfactory way. It was never written as a movie, or directed with any skill for building a hundred little things securely into one effec-

tive thing, and leading each thing into another, and holding all together. As a transcript of an early Shaw play it is all right enough. As something aimed at the kind of life and power we have come to expect of a good movie, it just isn't there, it dies on its own club feet.

There is no reason why the movies should stop making bad musical comedies so long as bad musical comedies make money in buckets, so the only squawk on "The Great American Broadcast" is that its standard ingredients for success in this field could have been shaped together for fair entertainment, as well. It is another of the Twentieth-Century-Fox series of Only Yesterday in Tinpan Alley and uses everything in the formula: the ups and downs of love in show business (radio, this time), specialty acts, songs, wisecracks, blows, background music with old tunes, and what we might call a Spitalny Finale. As usual, the story is only an excuse for introducing these baubles; but at the same time, and also as usual, the story manages to do a lot of shoving around and by the end has got half the emphasis all to itself.

At first they thought of doing an authentic history of radio as entertainment and imported a prominent studio engineer from the early days as adviser. Well, this gentleman worked up a lot of material, but this was too technical and dull, so they put a writer on with him and the two worked up one or more treatments, but these were technical and not bright enough. So apparently they said to hell with it and threw the stuff into the customary mill, with credits for four writers but nothing more from the engineer, or from history. So Jack Oakie meets John Payne in a fight and they meet Alice Faye. Jack loves Alice but she doesn't love him. Alice *hates* John but soon they are making with kisses, so Jack hates John. Cesar Romero loves Alice but she marries John and nobody loves Cesar, but Jack goes to work for him. Then Alice goes to Cesar on a technical matter and John hates Alice and leaves the country. Alice and Cesar are going to Reno, off with the old and on with the new, so Jack hates Cesar and manages to get hold of John. Jack wants to help John and now loves him, so they fight. Cesar goes away and Alice and John fight. Then they kiss. Then it says the end.

Along this way we meet incidents from the early hard times and later triumphs of broadcasting, and these furnish interesting background—fairly authentic though telescoped and sometimes shuffled for the story. At one point we see actual and exciting news-clips of the Dempsey-Willard fight in Toledo (and of the many blows struck throughout the picture, these are the only ones with any grace of meaning). The songs are pleasant, the Nicholas Brothers do a terrific act, the Ink Spots are there if you like them, and the Wiere Brothers go through their beautiful drollery again—it is worth a picture to see them, though they are no good in the first close-up chorus, and some of their magic is lost in the camera, having been designed for the set conditions of the stage. The rest of the picture is Jack Oakie, who is the solid fellow and clown throughout. He is not lovely; he might be found vulgar, dear dear; but he has energy and good humor in abundance, and he was the only one there who seemed to be having fun.

Archie Mayo directed, sometimes with a very heavy hand, not helping much with a script which has about the

general sense I have indicated, plus a constant treatment of particulars—lines and character play—which is about as light in getting off the ground as a dead fish. The picture had the best auspices in production, scoring, art work, camera (some of these departments being well above any mere Class A), but in the two factors which finally give a movie life—writing and direction—it is shabby and it is sad. We ought to say it is pure criminal waste, I suppose. But we can't, because it is not waste so long as yahoos swarm to it, bringing in their money two and threefold. For this is the money that makes possible these elaborately skilled departments of craftsmanship, establishing them as a sort of fund in trust, to be drawn upon equally for the bad and for the good when it comes along.

OTIS FERGUSON

A Communication

Why Not Tell the News?

SIR: It is gloomy enough to reflect that the most learned generation which the world has ever known about, with more of schools, universities, colleges, libraries, encyclopedias, card indices, newspapers, lectures, lecturers, teachers, professors; with the most amazing instruments for the transmission of information, radio, movie, television, is also the generation which seems to be in a fair way to proving itself the most foolish, the most cruel, the most destructive of its own happiness.

And one of the most puzzling facts in it all is that with our vast and complicated paraphernalia for making things known, for telling the world the news, the world somehow manages to miss just the news that is often of the most vital significance, with direct bearing upon today's policy; indispensable to life-and-death decisions; news which relates, not to matters of opinion and controversy, but to actual events.

The decision of masses of busy folk as to whether this country has any vital interest in helping to defend the British Empire will depend very largely—and rightly—upon their general view as to the character of that empire; as to what, broadly, it stands for in the world. It is obvious that if Americans as a whole took the view—which some have expressed—that German imperialism could not possibly be a more menacing or dangerous influence in the world than British imperialism has been and is likely to be, the administration could not obtain for its policy the rapidity of action, the patient and prolonged sacrifices necessary for success, and that victory would rest with the isolationists. It would do so in any case if doubt and hesitation caused action to come too late—precisely the result at which Nazi propaganda invariably aims. That propaganda is far too astute to attempt downright justification of the German cause, or a presentation of the German case. It concentrates upon the creation of doubt about the contrary case, in this situation the position of Great Britain. It was the method in France: "Why should France fight for Britain?" "Britain will fight to the last Frenchman." "British victory would make France a British dominion." . . . Such

appeals find response in things—old educational influences, folklore, mythologies, tribal animosities—that go deep in every country; feeling rooted in old notions uncorrected by knowledge of new facts. (The walls of French villages are plastered now with posters showing the burning of Joan of Arc; and the Irish in America are reminded of wrongs suffered at the hands of "Britain" seven hundred years ago, although then there was neither a Britain nor an England in the modern meaning of those words.) While the eighteenth-century picture of the British Empire still seems to hold the mind of this generation, all the later developments culminating in the Statute of Westminster, events of historical significance as great as the Declaration of Independence (indeed the Statute *was* the Declaration of Independence of half a dozen nations, with more to come, embracing far more people than that for which the American declaration spoke), seem to have left no real impress at all. The events have not been recorded by the press; most newspaper readers are unaware of them; many editors are obviously in complete ignorance of them.

A few weeks since, Mr. William Randolph Hearst's column "In the News" contained some paragraphs to the effect that Britain had never been known to give up anything in her empire, "never any valuable territory, never any strategic harbor," and that no one could possibly imagine her giving up "the great gold lands of the Rand." A little later in the Senate we had quite a number of speeches along those lines and were urged to "look at the map and see how much of the earth Britain owns." Senator Nye described Britain as the greatest aggressor in all modern history.

Now it is a matter of simple statutory fact, duly recorded in official documents, that Britain gave up over thirty years ago not only all "ownership" of the Rand mines (which in fact, of course, the British government never had, since ownership was vested in the mining companies whose shares were held by people of every country of the world, bought on every stock exchange of the world) but gave up all authority over the territory in which the mines are situated; all control of the government of that territory. Every function of government has been transferred to the government of the South African Union, the transfer being so complete that it is a mere statement of fact (enunciated in precise terms in the Statute of Westminster) to say that the British Parliament can no more legislate concerning the mines of the Rand, than it can for those of California or Nevada. If today the South African Union is using its resources in the fight against Nazidom (as was Greece and are China and the United States), it is as the result of a decision of the South African Parliament, which had the constitutional right to decide in the contrary sense of neutrality—and would have done so if the Malan-Hertzog combination had been a little more powerful—thus placing South Africa in the same company as the Irish Free State, at present neutral, for the greater convenience of the Luftwaffe in its bombardment of Liverpool and other British west-coast ports; and in its destruction of American material destined for those ports.

Mention of the position occupied by the Irish Free State reminds one that Mr. Hearst is as late with his news on the Irish as on the South American situation. Despite Mr. Hearst's categorical assurance that Britain never abandoned

a strategic harbor, the Irish harbors *were* abandoned. And they possess, as American naval men who were stationed there in the last war have very good reason to know, immense strategic importance. Refusal to permit their use by Britain makes it very much easier for the Nazi power to defeat the American policy of aid for Britain, to frustrate America's efforts in sending planes, munitions and war material.

Perhaps it was Mr. Hearst's information as to the position of Britain in respect of dominion territory which prompted demonstrators in Chicago the other day to carry banners with this device: "Let Britain Free the Slaves of Ireland," and other banners with this device: "Let Britain Free the Slaves of India." In Chicago, as elsewhere of late in the Middle West, at University and other meetings, I have been hearing a great deal concerning British oppression and exploitation of the Irish, the Boers, the Colonials, the Indians. But such facts as that for over twenty years India has made her own tariff and uses it often to the great disadvantage of British trade, that in thus surrendering tariff-making powers Britain has surrendered the characteristic instrument of economic imperialism, and has thus carried forward by an enormous step the process of "de-imperialization" which has gone on over most of the Empire—such facts are almost invariably unknown to those who make so easily the indictment of "British imperialism." Yet the facts are capital, and deeply affect the justice of the indictment.

And where the facts are known, as among certain students of politics, they are often not so much challenged, or explained away, as disregarded. The old generalizations about "British imperialism" are still made as though the trend of things which has brought independence to a Canada, an Australia, a New Zealand, a South Africa (undoing the conquest of the Boers), to an Ireland, to an Egypt (after conquest), and tentatively, also after conquest, to an Irak, was something having no historical significance. Yet the fact that the independence for which the thirteen colonies had to fight has been granted to Canada without war does not make the grant of independence less but more significant. It is a somewhat tragic fact that if there had been wars of independence for these new nations, the world would have rung with the story. Because there was no war, the world knows little of the facts.

Not that knowledge of the facts can be depended upon always to influence attitudes. Mr. Hearst could hardly have been ignorant of the discussion about the Irish harbors. But his picture of John Bull as the landowner who always holds what he has managed to grab, is so firmly set in his mind that no mere material fact of the external world can affect that mental picture. I suppose on a hundred occasions this last thirty years, when trying to confront the holders of certain theories with a few objective facts, I have been met with some such statement as this:

If what you say as to the fiscal position of the dominions is true, it would mean that Britain has been surrendering its main instrument of economic power—manipulation of tariffs, etc. Now, everyone knows that that is the sort of thing which Britain never does. So Britain has not done it. For everybody cannot be wrong.

It is a line of argument that makes possible the statement which I heard made the other day by a highly edu-

cated man, positively exuding academic degrees (and a Jew at that!), in about these terms: "It does not matter which side wins, since Britain is as imperialist as Germany: both are fighting to continue or extend economic exploitation of conquered peoples."

A view, you may argue, limited to Communists, careful to toe the party line. It is, on the contrary, very widespread. It is, indeed, the view expressed in only slightly different terms by Colonel Lindbergh when he tells us that all the trouble is due to the fact that "Britain owns too much, and Germany too little"; and that we could as easily live with a Europe dominated by Germany as by Britain.

If such views suit the communist book, they suit equally the book of those who fear that a victorious Britain would be a socialist Britain. And particularly, of course, they suit the book of Dr. Goebbels, since they are a perfect preparation for the moral confusions and the internal conflicts which, in the words of Hitler, enable him "to conquer a country from within"; to achieve its submission even before he has struck his final blow.

New York City

NORMAN ANGELL

The Bandwagon

He said France had chosen her present policy of collaboration with Germany freely. "For France it was a question of choosing between life and death," he said. — *UP dispatch from Vichy on Admiral Darlan's radio speech to the French nation, printed in The Boston Evening Globe.*

German fliers killed over England will receive a Christian burial, according to the ruling of the Church of England.

The decision has ended a nationwide controversy which arose over the burial of a Heinkel's crew in the churchyard at Steyning, Sussex. Villagers hotly protested that "these murderers should not be laid to rest beside our loved ones," but the Bishop of Chichester decided that the fallen fliers should be buried in the parish cemetery and that the burial service should be used.

The Bishop of London likewise has told his clergy to assume that Nazis are Christians and give them a suitable burial. — *UP dispatch from London, printed in The Mt. Vernon, Washington, Daily Herald.*

Tall Oaks from Little Acorns Grow

Marshall Timoshenko's order recalled the Soviet policy of neutrality which he said had brought "remarkable new victories" in Finland, Bessarabia and the Baltic States. — *AP dispatch from Moscow to The Christian Science Monitor.*

The Sultan of Swot

Eliphalet Nott holds the world's record for length of service as a college president. He served as president of Union College, Schenectady, for sixty-two years, thus bettering Babe Ruth's home-run record by two. — *From The New York Times.*

No Experience Necessary

They are teaching a new course at Miss Gill's School for Girls in the nearby Mendham Hills on how to live on an estate.

The lessons teach themselves. They consist of taking over and operating a mansion of thirty rooms and forty acres of land. — *AP dispatch to The New York Times from Morristown, N. J.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; \$1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Upton Sinclair to a Radical

SIR: I enclose copy of a letter which I have written to a California "radical," and which I thought might be of interest to some of your readers.

Pasadena, Calif.

UPTON SINCLAIR

[ENCLOSURE]

My dear F—:

Of course I am sorry to have to disagree with you. You must admit that I did not make the facts which confront us. They are horrible facts, but I have no choice but to adjust myself to them. You may say as many bad things as you please about the British government, just as you can say them about the government of California; but the basic fact is that the people of both places can change their government when they get ready, whereas under Hitler the people cannot change the government or even discuss it. That is why, being obliged to choose, I choose to support the government of Britain against the government of Hitler.

I do not like the fact that I live and retain my freedom because of the existence of the British fleet, but that happens also to be a fact, and I am powerless to change it. If we permit the British fleet to be destroyed we should face the entire world of dictators alone, and our chances of survival would be pretty slim. Hitler could take the whole of South America in six months, and the very best we could hope for would be to spend the next twenty years trying to fight him off.

Freight Charges and the Farm Problem

SIR: During the past twenty years this country has been confronted with a farm problem of major proportions. Various methods have been adopted in an endeavor to find a solution of this, the greatest of all our economic ills. For many months past, the nation's taxpayers have been called upon to contribute sums ranging from \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 annually, in order to alleviate the widespread distress which has prevailed in the agricultural regions of the United States. Since the rearmament program will consume a substantial portion of the income of all of the people of this country, there should be found ways and means of eliminating, or of substantially reducing, the tax burden which will inevitably accompany such expenditures.

In this connection, it is of interest to note the relationship existing between railroad grain rates in Canada as compared with similar freight charges in the United States, to wit:

From	To	Via	Grain	Miles	Per Bushel cents
Billings, Mont.	Duluth	Northern Pac.	Wheat	900	26½
Saskatoon, Sask.	Pt. Arthur	Canadian Pac.	Wheat	904	13¼

Although these two railroads operate parallel lines between Lake Superior and the Pacific Ocean, the transport charge of the former road is double the rate in effect via the Canadian carrier. More astonishing still, after this grain reaches the port of Duluth, the lake-steamer affreightment cost drops down to two cents per bushel covering a distance of 988 miles—Duluth to Buffalo—or about one-sixth of the Northern Pacific's charge for the 900-mile haul, Billings to Duluth. It would seem that if there is to be any solution of the farm problem, the nation's inland waterways must be used more extensively than has been the case heretofore.

New York City

LOUIS I. KEHOE

Wanted: Democratic Dynamism

SIR: I think it is necessary to add a few comments to Malcolm Cowley's article in the issue of May 5—"Poets and Prophets." The question is not what have you done in the past ten years to abet the growing passivity; but rather, what are you going to do now and in the next ten years? Passivity is having nothing to fight for. I don't think the score is forty to nothing against us. It can't be, for once we make that admission we *are* licked. The fight for social justice and social liberty is always present. The mere fact that it is intensified today is no reason for retreat.

Perhaps we have spent too much time looking outside the United States to Spain, China and Germany. Don't misunderstand me, this is not a plea for isolation; this is a brief for social dynamism. I think the wrong method is being used today to achieve the present type of dynamism: war. Wars come and go, the fight is far more subtle than that. It is necessary to have a positive force, not the negative force of war. Shall we call that positive pole Post-war Peace and Democratic Dynamism? This means a change—a big change—away from the determinism of the past thirty years. If the ideal is great enough in force, I have faith that we shall reach an approximation of it.

It isn't enough for the poet and intellectual to show what is wrong; he should also erect something in place of the destroyed. We have had enough debunking; let's have something constructive.

I am one of the "Kids," as Ralph Ingersoll, calls us. I feel it is necessary to look further than the present crisis. If we go to war, we go to war. But what about after the war? Do we return to the slough of despondency? Or do we work for what we want? Please stop thumbing your nose at people and telling them I told you so. We can't build on that.

Ithaca, N. Y.

ROBERT SAXTON TAYLOR

[Three cheers for the kids when they stop playing safe, keeping their necks in, and keep their chins up instead. "Democratic Dynamism" is a good slogan for them and for everybody else in the years beginning tomorrow. There are going to be dynamic changes in American life; there will have to be changes if this country is to survive, and it doesn't intend to go under. Provided we fight hard enough and wisely enough, they can be in a democratic direction. One way to fight more effectively is to start by admitting the mistakes and defeats of the past. That is what I was trying to do in "Poets and Prophets."—M. C.]

Letter from England

SIR: I feel that I must write and congratulate you upon a fine publication. I have been reading your journal for some considerable time through the kindness of a friend of mine in your country who mails it to me regularly. The latest copy to reach me contains the special supplement, "Democratic Defense." I only wish it could be read by every American. I was particularly struck by the article headed "The Lesson of British Experience." Every word you say in that article is true, though I am sorry to admit it. In the article following it you suggest that your country is repeating our mistakes. I pray to God that your people will awaken in time before your country is imperiled as ours is today, and before war breaks out on your shores and strikes at your homes and families as it has done here in Britain. We are paying now with our blood, toil, tears and sweat for the idiocy

of our policies in pre-war years; we came to the very brink of defeat.

There is an inference in your article that those mistakes in Britain have been discovered and remedied and that it is up to the United States to remedy them too. I am very much afraid that they still go on here in large measure, but courageous men are fighting against them and I do not think they will fight in vain.

It is good to see that the faults in your industrial organization and other aspects of your internal policies are being discussed and attempts made to find a remedy. You are to be commended for publishing so courageous a supplement. I only wish some of our journals had done something like it over here while we were still at peace.

Thank you for your admirable survey of the world situation week by week and for your sympathy toward this country and your continued endeavor to bring home to Americans that our fight is your fight and that only together can the United States and Great Britain win this war. Dark though the hour be, I believe we are gradually achieving that coöperation which will ultimately mean the doom of totalitarianism. Together we can, and we shall, win. I have not the slightest doubt of that.

Coventry, England

R. PENFOLD

Invasion by Ideas

SIR: Your letters from various military experts on the possibility of an invasion of America [The New Republic, May 12] are very interesting, but I think they left out the crucial point—a majority of our young men will not fight against Hitler.

The outstanding characteristic of the present war is its politico-ideological nature. There is a profound discontent among the middle classes, large sections of the upper class and, most important of all, among young persons, with the democratic-capitalistic society. It is this discontent which is Hitler's real secret weapon.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THEODORE SERRI

SIR: The only correct reply to John T. Flynn's assertion that Hitler cannot invade America is that Hitler's invasion is already under way. If the isolationists succeed in converting America to aid in the defeat of England, the Nazi invasion of America will then be complete. The Nazi fleet will be welcomed, not bombed.

But John T. Flynn will not be in the welcoming committee. He will be back in the liberal camp once more, which by then will be a concentration camp. The editors of The New Republic will be there, too; and Norman Thomas; and maybe they will let me in. Liberals always did enjoy getting a good pushing around, and—come the Nazis—we will get our bellyfull.

New York City

F. A. SIEVERMAN JR.

"Germany Executes Her Unfit"

SIR: There is interesting confirmation of Michael Straight's article, "Germany Executes Her Unfit" [The New Republic, May 5], in a German neurological journal, *Psychiatrisch-Neurologische Wochenschrift*, published at Halle, November 16, 1940 (Vol. 42, No. 46).

In an article entitled "Insanity Viewed as Battle," Dr. J. Bresler works out the philosophical justification for executing the insane. Operating on the distinction between human dignity or biological value and human value or symbiological value to the community, the author argues that while the insane have the same kind of human dignity as people suffering from other illnesses, they have no symbiotic value to the community, no "gemeinschaftswert." For the author, the "gemeinschaft" has mystical value greater than the sum of the individuals who make it up, and it is the instinct of the "gemeinschaft" not to destroy the ill ones.

Once this is granted, however, the author sets out to prove that in cases of insanity where the brain from birth, in consequence of severe trauma or defect, is "not capable of any mental activity or activity of the will, where there is no knowledge of the self," as is sometimes the case in paresis and dementia praecox, there is serious doubt whether we can even call such a life a human life. "It is not even a normal animal life," is his conclusion.

"The lawful destruction of such a life in which mental death has already occurred through nature is, under protection of law, not only justified, but in the interest of the people necessary, although the number of those [lives] is not great." The legalities are to be taken care of by the institution of a superior court, to which physicians would be appointed who would set precedents to be followed by all the higher courts.

Since in Germany the justification seems always to precede the act, the readers of Mr. Straight's article need not fear that they are listening to another World War atrocity story.

AEROL ARNOLD

Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.

Churchill's Prose Style

SIR: In his interesting review of Winston Churchill's latest book, Malcolm Cowley [The New Republic, April 21] comments especially on his "manner of writing." He quotes for its true and unaffected simplicity the "famous statement to Parliament from which the title of this book is taken: 'I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat.'"

Mr. Cowley might well have noted how nobly Mr. Churchill has here paraphrased and made his own Garibaldi's immortal words on summoning his followers, after the fall of the Roman Republic in 1849:

I offer neither pay, nor quarters, nor provisions; I offer hunger, thirst, forced marches, battles and death. Let him who loves his country in his heart and not with his lips only, follow me. —"Garibaldi's Defense of the Roman Republic," George Macaulay Trevelyan, p. 231.

JOSEPHINE GOLDMARK

Hartsdale, N. Y.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Elmer Luehr of Chicago, as a comment on our letters on "Can America Be Invaded?" (The New Republic, May 12), quotes from Hanson Baldwin's "United We Stand": "The author does not know a single responsible military or naval officer or government official who believes that this nation is threatened by direct invasion, even if Germany wins."

Excerpt of a letter from unoccupied France: "Naturally the politicians are not lagging far behind the procession. You cannot have failed to note that, ever since the start of the new regime, one of the great concerns of our municipal authorities, in their zeal not to displease Vichy, which knows its 'Candide' so well, is rechristening streets and squares—not to restore the picturesque names of olden times, but only to replace the names of leftists with those of rightists. When you see the former citizen, Doctor Camboulive, Deputy-Mayor of Albi, order the bust of Jaurès taken out of the Mayor's office and replaced by a bust of Pétain; when you see little Max Bonnefous, prefect of Algeria, formerly entrusted by Levy-Bruel, in the name of the 'Friends of Jaurès,' with the task of editing the publication of the complete works of the dead leader, accepting—perhaps even suggesting—that the Rue Jean-Jaurès should become the Rue Jean Chiappe, one is completely disgusted."

Volume I, Number 1, of Labor Today, 82 West Washington Street, Chicago, is out. Harry D. Wohl and Elmer W. Lysen are the editors of this pocket-size monthly.

Marginalia

WHEN THE GERMANS invaded Norway in April, 1940, the market for new books suddenly vanished. Thousands of literate people ceased to read anything that was less up-to-date or required more concentration than the latest edition of their afternoon paper. Other thousands must have stopped reading altogether, to judge by newspaper circulation figures, which were expected to rise steeply but instead showed a tendency to decline. Perhaps the reason was that listening to the radio, a wholly passive occupation, was more in keeping with the mood of a period when the country was waiting for its future to be decided by events in which it was taking no active part. And what about the people who had no radios or refused to listen? They could get all the bad news their minds were able to digest merely by glancing at the headlines. Later, when German planes were falling by hundreds during the Battle of Britain, newspapers were read more eagerly; but it was not until the British had won this first battle that the book-selling season again got under way.

I return to this already ancient story because it seems to have been repeated this spring, after the Germans invaded Yugoslavia and Greece. Once more the sale of most books fell sharply and the appearance of others was indefinitely postponed. The publishers, however, were less alarmed than they had been the year before, since they remembered that the winter of 1940-41 had been for many of them the busiest on record. People start reading again between battles.

Meanwhile the unexpected hit of the spring season—four printings in five days—has been a novel by a young woman of twenty-three who was graduated last June from the University of Michigan. I imagine that most readers of "Whistle Stop" (Random House, \$2.50) will wonder why it has been given such long and cordial reviews. Miss Wolff tells an interesting story, the background she paints is convincing and all but two of her characters are real. Still, her book is less original than most of the reviews would lead us to believe. And it moves in several directions, as if the author hadn't quite made up her mind about the sort of novel she was writing.

It begins in the jovially sordid atmosphere of "February Hill," with the Veech family of Michigan apparently trying to copy the Harris family of Massachusetts in shiftlessness, prostitution and petty thievery. After a few chapters we find ourselves in the midst of a serious small-town novel like many others, except for a situation of near-incest between Kenny and Mary Veech, who seem not so much people as effective dream symbols borrowed from early Romantic literature; they are proud and accursed spirits like Manfred and his sister. We read a few chapters more, and the book is transformed into a gangster story like those of W. R. Burnett ("Kenny threw down the gun as if it had burned his hand and ran for Gitlo's car"). At the end, Miss Wolff tries to extract a deeper meaning from her whole assortment of plots: something about the mechanical violence of small-town life, where the people move "in their active, grotesque patterns like the silent meaningless figures of a dream." The novel as a whole is easy to read, with several effective scenes, but nobody except the author is going to remember it for a long time. It is popular at the

moment because, with all its faults, it is young, fresh, honest, and because it has nothing whatever to do with the war.

"The Long Week End" (Macmillan, \$3) is a contemporary history, a yesterbook that is based somewhat more on extensive reading and somewhat less on personal observation than others of its type. The period covered is 1918 to 1939; the scene is Great Britain and especially her capital city; the authors are Robert Graves and Alan Hodge. Since they were absent from London during most of this period—Mr. Graves having lived in the Balearic Islands and the United States—they approach their subject almost like foreigners, and this lends freshness to their treatment of events. At the same time, it makes them dependent on the material to be found in memoirs and the files of magazines and newspapers, which often did not print the whole story.

Their book is full of forgotten or—to most Americans—unfamiliar information about such subjects as the Loch Ness monster, Oxford bags (worn originally at Cambridge), Tutankhamen, Dr. Marie Stopes (who is not a doctor of medicine) and the circulation wars among London newspapers. The two authors have a good many humors and crochets: for example, they like to disparage the morals of Nottingham and the poetry of W. H. Auden. On the other hand, they write from no general point of view, not even that of their well chosen title; they merely set forth the facts as they found them. The one theme to which they return time and again is the rapid Americanization of England. This process began just after the Armistice, with American movies, jazz bands and popular songs; then it went on to silk stockings, lipsticks, put-and-take, divorce, mah jong, Broadway slang, advertising campaigns, crossword puzzles, gangster stories and magazines designed to imitate *Time*, *Life* and *The New Yorker*; finally it affected even highbrow literary styles (the word "highbrow" being another American importation). By 1939, it was being said in London that New York was the cultural capital of the English-speaking world.

Messrs. Graves and Hodge pay a good deal of attention to literature, as one would expect, and many of their incidental remarks about it are angry and illuminating. There is, however, one literary phenomenon on which they fail to comment. During the last few years, and more rapidly since the war, English writing has been shifting its social base. As recently as 1939, it was still the property of the moneyed classes and the two great universities. It had the characteristics of a leisure-class literature, that is, correctness, reticence, scholarship and scholarly allusions, an air of good breeding and a noticeable lack of vitality. All that is rapidly changing. The qualities one finds in the newer English writing are candor—even bluntness—accuracy of factual statement combined with a slipshod vocabulary, realism about sex and money, and a general lack of snobbishness. As for subject matter, the new writers like to deal with aspects of England that are almost unknown in this country: life along the great arterial roads, life in seaside hotels built for the masses, life in shops and factories. There have been a few proletarian novels, but most of the new literature seems to be written by and about the intellectuals of the lower middle class: teachers, clerks, minor government officials, the white-collar people in general. Perhaps a principal reason for the popularity of American books in England is that this country went through a similar process

even sooner. Middle class speaks to middle class across the ocean.

Everything printed in these days of crisis—a scholarly article, a fashion report, this page of marginal notes on writers and writing—is composed to the accompaniment of news by radio. Everything we do—whether making money or planning the children's education or pulling weeds in the garden—has that same background and chorus. Or rather it is our thoughts and actions that serve as the atmospheric background for the pleasant or portentous voice

that announces new disasters between plugs for Sweetheart soap and Harvester cigars and the alkaline way to cure hangovers. That voice, the never forgotten and omniscient Voice, has become the arbiter of our daily lives; we spin the dial and wait for it to announce whether our acts have been meaningful or wasted. Some day the Voice will proclaim that our whole world is ending at 11.15 tomorrow, at the close of the mid-morning news period. It will then advise us to meet our God with clean and radiant faces, after washing them thoroughly with Sweetheart soap.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Books in Review

The War and the Poets

We found it ourselves.

We looked and we had come here.

— Archibald MacLeish

THIS AMBITIOUS VOLUME¹ seeks to accomplish two things. It attempts to present the best British and American poems of the current period, to explore the poetic output of the two countries in "the most important year in modern history"; and through that poetry it tries to illuminate and render clear the contemporary "soul under the duress of vast despairs." Most of the verse included has been written in the past eighteen months; some of it has never before appeared in print. On this time-scale, the book becomes a collection of poetry about mankind at war. For the first time we are given a concentrated opportunity to feel the full impact of the poetic revival which, in the face of widespread destruction, creates new values.

With poets as varied in age, outlook and method as Conrad Aiken and Hugh Chisholm, Robinson Jeffers and Muriel Rukeyser, Marianne Moore and W. H. Auden, Wallace Stevens and Theodore Spencer, William Carlos Williams and Delmore Schwartz, there is a wide range of tone, power and thought in this volume. What gives the poets included a common bond (and here perhaps we may find the real basis for their selection) is clarity of perception into the apparent chaos of the age, intensity of emotion about man's conflict in the historic process, vividness of directly observed image, compactness of naked thought liberated from literary convention, speed in the movement of ideas and words.

To say that these poems are the voice of modern man is to say that they derive from the basic revolution in thought of the past three decades. Neither form nor the problem of form inhibits the poet's expression. He lays his hands with ease on whatever form the occasion demands. More important: the modern poet, like the modern painter, knows that all reality is one, that all its segments are interrelated, however discordant and contradictory the seething fragments may at first appear; that there is no separation between sen-

suous experience and remembered event; between immediate observation and abstract conclusion; between present and past, headline and history; between the anonymous man coming toward you in a cafeteria and mankind fighting for its future across vast spaces of the world.

In this sense, W. H. Auden's remarkable war poem, "September 1, 1939," which first appeared in *The New Republic*, is an important key to the anthology. Here the poet is neither the crucified nor the redeemer; he is a man. As such he plays no tricks of fantasy; he does not pretend to be covering the battlefields as a literary cameraman for an ideal picture weekly. He does not see the world from an imaginary height, but from a dive on Fifty-second Street, where he sits

Uncertain and afraid
As the clever hopes expire
Of a low dishonest decade.

His vision rises first to the surrounding world; then to the historic heritage which has fashioned it; then to the evaluation of history. Everywhere across space and time, as far back as "exiled Thucydides," or here and now among the "faces along the bar" which "cling to their average day," the poet sees what is for him the essential wisdom of all times and this time: that those to whom evil is done do evil in return; that we must love one another or die; that while the world lies defenseless in stupor under the night, there are just men exchanging messages; that the poet, aware he is composed of Eros and dust, and beleaguered by negation and despair, may also show an affirming flame.

A similar idea pulses through George Barker's "First American Ode." Here also the images—Lorca and Eliot, Poe and Melville, the Pacific fluttering occasional storms and the pillow of the Rockies, Abraham Lincoln with forty-eight stars in his hand and the clarinet recording the memorials of the heart run to seed—converge toward the gospel of love:

Because Love is ample you need no example
History serves no precedent to any present.
What is our past but exhaustion of negatives,
The accumulation of wrongs on hopes of right?
I question the wiser vegetable or flower of glory
To tell me their mortality of existence
And no words answer: but the leaves, O life laden,

¹ *New Poems: 1940. An Anthology of British and American Verse*, edited with an introduction by Oscar Williams. Foreword by George Barker. New York: The Yardstick Press; a Living Age Book. 278 pages. \$2.50.

Unfold and flower and shower the incredible gold,
The running silver, which are Love and tolerance.

Richard Eberhart, seeing a dead groundhog in the "golden fields," thinks of death—which overtakes whole civilizations as well as individual creatures:

I stood there in the whirling summer,
My hand capped a withered heart,
And thought of China and of Greece,
Of Alexander in his tent;
Of Montaigne in his tower,
Of Saint Theresa in her wild lament.

This is no mere submission to the idea that death is inevitable, or mere enjoyment in the passing of things; these speculations on mortality are predicated on the knowledge that life is stronger than death. The poets, as Archibald MacLeish explains in one of the finest of the poems, have discovered history; they are sustained by a profound sense of the continuity of existence. Thus Horace Gregory, writing from Europe in that fateful autumn when so many European poets were driven to America, sees the death of an old civilization, but sees also that unconquerable force which must of necessity create a new one:

Since I have seen the end of a long day,
of peace that was the mirror of old wars,
my voice shall echo from another night
and from its tireless, wheeling stars unfold
light within darkness that replies,

more light,

heard from the lips of a last, dim, anonymous face,
the child born crying into a naked world.

A poem like this, and scores of others in the anthology, supports the editor's claim that whatever else the landslide of events may have buried, it has not buried our poets.

JOSEPH FREEMAN

Gabfest

This Above All, by Eric Knight. New York: Harper and Brothers. 473 pages. \$2.50.

MR. ERIC KNIGHT's story of Britain at war is planned as a study of English men and women in a time of crisis—how they relate themselves to the war, struggle to believe in its democratic nature, fight and die, or escape into safe hiding. But it is primarily concerned with two people: an illegitimate youth who has come through Dunkirk and lost faith in his country's aims, and an upper-class girl in one of the women's services who takes him as her lover and fights to bring back his old belief.

The book's popularity in this country must be due not only to its timeliness but to the American reader's conviction that Mr. Knight's people are *echt* English in their speech and way of life. In writing for an American audience Mr. Knight has painted portraits which studiously reflect the American's popular conceptions: they are a depressing contrast to the Yorkshiremen he gave us in his first novel, "Song on Your Bugles." The gentry adopt a strange language of mixed vintage—the kind to which Eric Blore and Edward Everett Horton have been obliged to adapt them-

selves, but one with which the serious novelist has no business. It is painful even when intentionally sarcastic: "To the Buffs, my lass, and a couple of egads! The 1890 port, Clinkers! And damme no heeltaps!" While the lovers, with their stiff little names, Clive and Prudence, cynically debate their relationship like quack psychologists quarreling over a trauma: "Don't crumble the defenses of my phrases"—"I'll restore all your feminine ego."—"Shall we complicate things by trying to express reasons?"—"Far be it from me to be suggestive, madame."—"We all desire to possess avidly."

One would not emphasize this question of speech above all were it not that conversation fills almost the entire book. The descriptive passages—such as the story of the rear-guard action in Flanders—stand out like blue heavens in a cloud of chatter. Mr. Knight cannot keep his people's mouths shut; together, they argue incessantly; alone, they talk to themselves; asleep, Mr. Knight wakes them up with a bomb or two and starts them ticking again. Through these hundreds of pages of drumfire Mr. Knight's hero attains to salvation, his heroine to motherhood, and England to democratic battle. What is against all tactical rules is that these objectives should have been reached with so few casualties among American readers and reviewers.

NIGEL DENNIS

Tearful Standard

Milton and His Modern Critics, by Logan Pearsall Smith. Boston: Atlantic-Little, Brown Books. 87 pages. \$1.50.

OF RECENT YEARS, in some advanced quarters, Milton-baiting has made a busy and solemn critics' holiday. It is time that these Milton-baiters had their hair slapped down, but Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith in this little book hardly shows himself the man to do it. Commanding neither the Comanche war-whoop of Ezra Pound nor the distilled poison-drop of T. S. Eliot, he fails to deal with their main contentions, and too often loses himself instead in personal attacks on their merits as poets and their erudition as critics.

It is amusing when Mr. Smith demurely conducts a pseudo-scholarly inquiry into whether Pound first stepped the streets of London attired as a cowboy or as a Regency buck. But it is merely absurd, as well as irrelevant, for him to imply that Pound has no poetic talent. And it is even more absurd to suggest that Eliot, one of the most chiseled poets and precise of prose craftsmen in our day, fails to appreciate Milton because, with other "hasty writers," he has no feeling for "the labors of the file, the exquisite pains and pleasures of polishing." Then, for good measure, Mr. Smith lumps Middleton Murry, Herbert Read, Bonamy Dobrée and F. R. Leavis as a group of *enfants terribles* misled by these two Middle Western Davids into trying to bring down the gigantic figure of Milton with a slingshot.

Milton's own invective on the dirty sox of Salmasius would seem to have been the model for Mr. Smith's more refined Georgian emulation. Half of his pages he devotes to a nice denigration. Nowhere does he really try to analyze what strange defect of sensibility has made these able critics anesthetic to Milton. The more positive half of his work is equally unsatisfying. He makes good points in defending the poetic effectiveness of Milton's syntax and linguistic inversions. Beyond this rhetorical analysis he is both precious

and sentimental. It is sentimental to use tears in the eyes as so important a standard as Mr. Smith does, and only an esthete will follow him in explaining Milton's greatness as verbal music, an array of jeweled words, and in depreciating his powers of thought. No just evaluation of Milton, of course, can ignore his magnificent and varied melody. But no high achievement can be measured predominantly in such terms. Milton's grandeur lies even more profoundly in the depth of his thought. That thought Mr. Smith almost wholly ignores.

EDGAR JOHNSON

Freedom and Its Enemies

Landscape of Freedom: The Story of Personal Liberty in America, by Mauritz Hallgren. New York: Howell, Soskin and Company. 444 pages. \$3.50.

MAURITZ HALLGREN has written a thoughtful history of freedom in the United States and of the restrictions upon it from colonial times to the present. (Incidentally, he has at the same time written a history of American customs and manners, political and social.) His book is an illuminating record of the cruelties and annoyances which some men and women have continually tried to inflict on men, women and children throughout the course of our history. Many of the cruelties had their base in economic advantage, and liberation has frequently been the result of cruelty becoming economically obsolete.

The men who came to the wilds of America in the seventeenth century, to escape restrictions on their religious liberties and economic opportunities, brought with them the ideas of freedom which were being disseminated in Europe by philosophers and agitators. They also brought with them religious intolerance of any but their own sects. The fight between bigotry, too often led by the clergy, and individual liberty has continued to characterize American social history ever since. Intolerance has not only manifested itself in the realm of theology, but was expressed, and still is, in the field of education and in taboos on individual desires. Mr. Hallgren traces the origins of both liberty and intolerance and outlines the complex variations of their patterns during the several phases of our history. Many of the early restrictions on individual happiness were due, he points out, to the stern effort of the early settlers to let nothing interfere with the struggle for existence in a new land. Later, industrial expansionists also felt that prohibitions were good—for labor. But even in colonial times, when the influence of the preacher was predominant, because of the absence of lawyers, politicians and corporations, the effort to make men righteous by statute and punishment was a troublesome failure. Mr. Hallgren is also aware of the significance of the frontier as an outlet for men who found life too rigid in the original settlements.

The golden age of American liberty, Mr. Hallgren believes, was the period of Jeffersonian democracy. Soon after the Revolution, however, labor's struggle for the right to live created industrial unrest, which in turn brought political and economic oppression. In each section of his book Mr. Hallgren discusses the battles of labor and the attempts to keep the majority both poor and docile.

A valuable contribution of the book is its clear resumé of mob action in the United States, from the instigators of

Salem witchcraft to A. Mitchell Palmer and to date. Mr. Hallgren discusses mob persecution of Masons, Catholics, Jews, Negroes, Mormons and Abolitionists, as well as rent wars, flour riots, temperance raids and race conflicts. When Americans have been impatient to expand, they have usually been intolerant of liberty. The beginning of imperialist expansion in the early twentieth century was the most oppressive period politically and economically, with the exception of the period of continental expansion at the end of the eighteenth century and the period of industrial expansion in the eighteen eighties and nineties. Alien and sedition laws were used by the Federalist Party, which aimed to establish government by property qualification; and deportation, denial of the mails and imprisonment were used by their Republican and conservative Democratic successors before and during the First World War. Americans have frequently been in the habit of taking the law into their own hands or of perverting it to special interests, and Mr. Hallgren has not missed any important or illuminating instance of either tendency.

Mr. Hallgren is suspicious of the trend of the New Deal toward centralization, and he is afraid that wards of the state are apt to lose their liberties even though they may gain economic advantages. He finds it disturbing that there has been no criticism from the masses of Roosevelt centralization, but he concludes that so long as the Constitution remains, there is hope for the continuance of our freedom.

In addition to its importance as a political and economic essay, Mr. Hallgren's book is valuable for its amusing and enlightening material on the relations of the sexes and the drinking and gambling habits of our people. M. R. WERNER

IS THIS TRUE OF YOU?

"It is vain to hope that Hanson W. Baldwin's book, **UNITED WE STAND**, will be read by 'every intelligent citizen'," writes Lindsay Rogers in **THE NATION**. "It is too serious, too closely reasoned, and too replete with facts, figures and tables."

Does this apply to you? Or are you among those who will take the time to find out *where we really stand today in matters of defense*? Then get a copy now of this tremendously important book by the man of whom Malcolm Cowley in *The New Republic* says, "Baldwin is the most widely respected of our writers on military affairs. He seems better informed and speaks with a tone of greater authority than any other civilian. The story he tells is partly reassuring but chiefly alarming."

Hanson W. Baldwin's

UNITED WE STAND!

— Defense of the Western Hemisphere —

The only book that tells what you want to know about the true state of our defenses!

\$3.00 • WHITTLESEY HOUSE • New York

Crimes of a Month

WITH the most proficient perpetrators of crime and mystery providing fantastic examples of their powers in the world's news, a mere writer of crime stories has to risk being incredible or his fiction can't possibly compete with fact. A spy story especially has a tough time managing not to read like some of Louisa Alcott's little men and women.

So Manning Coles has jumped smack into the utterly improbable in Crime Club's "A Toast to Tomorrow," and he gets away with it, largely because he has such a plausible air of knowing his way about officialdom in the Third Reich. He tells a tale of a man who was washed ashore at Ostend in 1918, unconscious and unidentifiable. Memory of who he was and what he had been kept eluding him, but he fitted so easily into the life about him that no one, not even himself, doubted his nationality. He rose with the new party till he became chief of the German police. And then one day memory came back and told him that, during the Other war, he had lived in Germany as a British agent. Goebbels' enmity puts a stop to the help he could now give England—a story-writer can't make such recent history something it wasn't. But he can—as Manning Coles has done—put exciting and convincing adventure into the setting of history.

There's a hint in "The Turning Sword" (Harpers) that Spencer Bayne's smart document examiner, Hendrik Pieter Minuit Van Kill, will soon be doing war work. For the present he is getting his steam up by probing the connection between one of those troglodytic organizations—Christian Cavaliers they are called in this instance—and two bright girls investigating same for the publisher of a pornographic crime periodical. It's a connection involving a couple of murders and some fairly complicated psychology. Van Kill wears an imposing amount of erudition less flossily than most savant sleuths, and works with the police without swank or condescension. One of Mr. Bayne's virtues as a story-teller is that he is quite as much at home with a surprising variety of human, intelligent and efficient police detectives as he is with more out-of-the-way characters like Homeric Greek restaurateurs, philosophic dealers in rare books, titled lady novelists, midgets and boy prodigies. And he can be funny. He weaves his plot so tightly and tells so much of it allusively that you can't read him with one eye straying to other matters.

G. D. H. and Margaret Cole carry on in air-raided England with a double-barreled problem in detection in "Counterpoint Murder" (Macmillan). How could two entirely unrelated killings, unsolvable because the logical suspect in each of them had a perfect alibi, help each other to the ends of justice? That pleasant and competent Inspector Wilson finds out.

Fast and easy reading, with good puzzlement, is Will Oursler's "The Trial of Vincent Doon" (Simon and Schuster), where the defense attorney solves the mystery right in the courtroom by the way he examines witnesses, and in Lawrence Blockman's "See You at the Morgue" (Duell, Sloan and Pearce), which isn't so grisly as it sounds, where a "ghost secretary" picks up most of the important clues.

MORT. POST

Contributors

WILLIAM HARLAN HALE has been for many years a student of naval affairs. His last article in The New Republic, "Fighting the Ships with Jane," was a study of British and German claims to ship-sinkings.

THOMAS PARRAN, M.D., is Surgeon General of the United States. He is the author of "Shadow on the Land."

WILLSON WHITMAN is a newspaper woman. Her family has lived for four generations in the second congressional district of Texas, the Dies district.

H. N. BRAILSFORD, London correspondent for The New Republic, is widely known as a writer on history, economics and international affairs.

LEGARDE S. DOUGHTY has contributed verse, essays and fiction to some forty periodicals. He lives on a farm near Augusta, Georgia.

SIR NORMAN ANGELL was a Labor Member of the British Parliament from 1929-31 and is the author of many books on political and economic subjects, the most recent of which is "America's Dilemma: Alone or Allied?"

JOSEPH FREEMAN, author of "An American Testament," has published verse, literary criticism and fiction. He is now at work on a full-length novel.

EDGAR JOHNSON is a member of the English department at the College of the City of New York, and the author of "One Mighty Torrent: The Drama of Biography."

M. R. WERNER's latest book, written in collaboration with Thomas Robson Hay, is "The Admirable Trumpeter: A Biography of General James Wilkinson," just published by Doubleday, Doran and Company.

BOOKS AND PICTURES

INTERNATIONAL BOOK & ART SHOP—17 W., 8th St. N.Y.C.

FINAL CLEARANCE

SALE!

BOOKS and PICTURES at minimum prices!
Original Etchings—from Twenty-five Cents up

Water-colors — Drawings — Lithographs
original and facsimile — half price and less!

INTERNATIONAL BOOK & ART SHOP, 17 West 8th St., N. Y. C.

To rent a summer place, or to rent an apartment for the summer, use THE NEW REPUBLIC. special classified rate: 45c a line of seven words; minimum ad, three lines. Send copy to reach us by Monday for issue appearing on Thursday of same week.

LANGUAGES

speak read SPANISH

QUICKLY, EASILY, CORRECTLY

The Linguaphone Method enables you to speak SPANISH—or any of 29 languages—by LISTENING to voices of native teachers in your own home. Amazingly simple, thorough, sound; FREE BOOK.

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
88 RCA Building New York City

SUMMER RENTAL

FURNISHED from June 15 to Oct. 1, three-room apartment, bath, garage, suitable for one or two adults. References. Box 228, Great Neck, N. Y.

WEARING APPAREL

BECAUSE WE CLOSE June 28th for entire summer, every lovely model dress, suit and coat is offered at absolute clearance. During June consult with us regarding vacation clothes problem. Miss Goodman, 474 Seventh Avenue (at 36th St.). LA 4-4013.